THE

Churchman's Magazine.

VOL. 6.] JULY AND AUGUST, 1809. [No. 4.

BIOGRAPHY.

MEMOIR OF MRS. SUSANNAH HOPTON.

[*From the Orthodox Churchman's Magazine and Review for July*, 1808.]

THIS excellent and ingenious lady was born in the year 1627. She was married to Richard Hopton, Esq.* of Kington, in Herefordshire; one of the Welsh judges in the reigns of Charles and James II. Mr. Hopton died about 1696, and left her without issue in very plentiful circumstances. Her character, as drawn by the Rev. Nathaniel Spinkes in the preface to her "Meditations and Devotions," printed in 1717, is highly edifying.

"She was well known," says that pious writer, "to keep up a constant course of devotion, not only in herself, but in her family, and not only on the Lord's day, but throughout the whole week, setting apart five times every day for religious worship, from which she would not suffer herself to be diverted by any business that was not very extraordinary. Even in her old age, and the cold winter season, she would be up, and in the closet at her matins by four of the clock in the morning, from which custom she was for a long time not to be discouraged, either by the effects of her declining age, or by the extremity of the weather. So that she might truly say with the royal Psalmist, 'Mine eyes prevent the night watches, that I might be occupied in thy words;' though for some time before she died, she was prevailed with to forbear till five or six. She neither indulged herself in diet nor sleep so much as her years

* He was a great benefactor to the Clergy, and restored to the Church the impropriation of Bishop's Frome, in the county of Hereford.

that Mr. R. and his Presbyterian brethren, are those who "by manifestation of the truth, as the Apostles did, commend themselves to each man's conscience in the sight of God!" We know not which most to admire in this passage, its *modesty* or its *charity*. We wish not to impute to Mr. R. the want of either, and still less to doubt his piety and amiable disposition. To what then shall we attribute, what we so often perceive in Calvinistic preachers, the arrogant assumption of exclusive evangelical zeal and fidelity, and censorious judgment of others? We refer it to the gloomy, austere, and arrogating spirit of the religious system which they embrace—and which, when not counteracted by other religious principles, or by strong constitutional humility and mildness, never fails to produce self-sufficiency, censoriousness, and spiritual pride.

On the conduct of the Editor of the Christian's Magazine we shall speak as we have always done, and as we shall most certainly continue to do on all fit occasions, with a freedom which can smile at his wrath equally as at his pleasantry, and which cares for the one as little as for the other. Events which happened at a period so distant that it is difficult to ascertain the true state of facts, are exhibited in the Christian's Magazine in such a dress as to expose the Episcopal clergy concerned in them to disgrace and odium. When these statements, founded originally on *ex parte* declarations, are denied, the Editor has recourse to the solitary and indistinct recollection of a non-Episcopal clergyman, whose memory the weight of venerable years has certainly not sharpened, and to the assertions of a young man who discovers in his writing so much weakness and want of judgment, that the cause must be desperate which can confidently rely on his apprehension of the meaning of terms, or on his account of a long conversation. The recollection of one clergyman is thus arrayed against another; the statement of a young man against the solemn asseverations of a respectable minister who was once his pastor. And yet the Editor has "never allowed personalities to mingle with his strictures!"—All this is done with the most perfect good humour, with the innocent intention of enlivening dull religious discussion with a little harmless pleasantry! The spirit that dictated all this, is "utterly unconscious of an emotion which would lead to the hurt of a human being!!" "Irascible" must be the mind that can see in this any ground of crimination! The heart that prompted, and the head that planned this series of personal altercation and attack, meant no "hurt"—only indulged an harmless flight "on the wing of imagination," and kindly "dressed an excoriated spot with a preparation of attic salt;" emulous of the fame of Lucian and Swift! We know not what spirit swayed, or what mantle clothed this prophet; but we are certain it was not the *mantle* of a prophet of Israel, nor the *spirit* of Israel's meek and lowly King.

THE

Churchman's Magazine.

VOL. 6.] JULY AND AUGUST, 1809. [No. 4.

BIOGRAPHY.

MEMOIR OF MRS. SUSANNAH HOPTON.

[*From the Orthodox Churchman's Magazine and Review for July*, 1808.]

THIS excellent and ingenious lady was born in the year 1627. She was married to Richard Hopton, Esq.* of Kington, in Herefordshire; one of the Welsh judges in the reigns of Charles and James II. Mr. Hopton died about 1696, and left her without issue in very plentiful circumstances. Her character, as drawn by the Rev. Nathaniel Spinkes in the preface to her "Meditations and Devotions," printed in 1717, is highly edifying.

"She was well known," says that pious writer, "to keep up a constant course of devotion, not only in herself, but in her family, and not only on the Lord's day, but throughout the whole week, setting apart five times every day for religious worship, from which she would not suffer herself to be diverted by any business that was not very extraordinary. Even in her old age, and the cold winter season, she would be up, and in the closet at her matins by four of the clock in the morning, from which custom she was for a long time not to be discouraged, either by the effects of her declining age, or by the extremity of the weather. So that she might truly say with the royal Psalmist, 'Mine eyes prevent the night watches, that I might be occupied in thy words;' though for some time before she died, she was prevailed with to forbear till five or six. She neither indulged herself in diet nor sleep so much as her years

* He was a great benefactor to the Clergy, and restored to the Church the impropriation of Bishop's Frome, in the county of Hereford.

required, but contented herself with less in both these respects than those about her judged convenient for her; so much was she above gratifying the flesh, and so desirous not to fall short of any mortification she apprehended her religion to have required of her. She was a constant observer of not only the Feasts, but Fasts of the Church likewise, and was much scandalized at the generality of those who profess themselves members of the Church of England, for showing no more regard to such days: wherein were she but duly followed by others, the good effects of such a practice might well be expected to show themselves here, as well as they do in the Greek Church, of which it is noted in these times of hardship and ignorance amongst them, that a great part of the religion they have yet left, is owing to their constant observance of these solemnities. And as her prayers, so did her alms likewise ascend up to heaven, to prepare her a place there, that when her prayers here should cease, she might be admitted to sound forth eternal hallelujahs with the blessed choirs of saints and angels. For she was not sparing in these; but as she had a fortune to do it, so she took care to dispense them bountifully, though sometimes with great secrecy, whilst she lived, and was liberally munificent at her death. It would have grieved one to hear the sad lamentations that were amongst her neighbours at Kington, not long before her death, by reason of her removal from thence to Hereford, where, some time after, she ended her days, after she had lived to a good old age, being eighty-one years old and upwards; which time she had improved to the best purposes, in serving God, and doing good in her generation. Nor was her bounty confined to that neighbourhood, though most remarkable there, for it extended to the poor and needy in far distant places, where she saw occasion, as appears from several letters of thanks, that were found amongst her papers after her decease. Another good quality observable in her was, that she was of a very grateful temper, insomuch that when she had any way received an obligation, she was observed to be very uneasy till she had expressed her sense of it, by a suitable return, and usually to the advantage of such as had obliged her.

And it is not to be wondered, that a person thus religiously disposed, should, upon all occasions, be ready to express a

particular respect for the Clergy, and love, as she did, to converse with such of note amongst them, as she could reasonably hope to improve by, or be any ways assisted, in order to the right performance of her duty. She well remembered our blessed Saviour's infinite love, not only in dying for us miserable sinners, but moreover in instituting the holy Eucharist, in memory of his body broken, and his blood poured forth for our redemption, and not only readily embraced all opportunities of attending upon this sacred ordinance, but did it with the greatest solemnity and reverence: and well knowing what especial advantages the devout Christian receives from so near approach to his blessed Saviour, she looked upon it, and longed after it as a foretaste of that heavenly banquet, whereof she promised herself to be made partaker, when she should be admitted to an immediate enjoyment of him. It was the delight of her soul to commemorate his love, and bless him for his goodness, though in the humblest manner that she could.

And though not learnedly educated, yet by converse with the best divines, and the best English authors, she had attained to a very considerable knowledge in divinity, and has been a good benefactress to the age, by the religious and instructive works she left behind her.

She was the first reformer of the "Devotions in the Ancient Way of Offices," sent up to the singularly learned, and truly reverend Dr. Hickes, now with God, and by him revised, improved, and communicated to the public;* which shows her natural genius, the soundness of her judgment, and the divine temper of her soul, that led her to make choice of a book of such unusual flights of devotion, such rapturous fancy, and such highly affecting expressions, as are rarely, if ever, to be met with in any work of merely human composure. It was no little time and pains that she laid out in correcting these seraphic offices, purging out what was offensive in their original draught, and fitting them for the use of all well-disposed members of the Church of England, whereby to elevate their souls to God, and bring them as near to heaven as can be, whilst they remain on this side of it. A work that calls for our grateful acknowledgments at present, and may deservedly render

* It was published by the Dean in one volume duodecimo in 1701: and was reprinted in 1712, and again in 1717.

her memory precious to succeeding generations. Nor did Mrs. Hopton employ herself only in meditations and devotions, but in the argumentative way too. A very remarkable evidence whereof she has given in the controversy between the Church of England and that of Rome: it was once her great misfortune, in her younger years, to be won over to the Romish communion. But upon further consideration and experience of the doctrines and worship of that corrupt Church, she recovered herself, as Dr. Reynolds, Mr. Chillingworth, and others had done before her; and not only happily remembered from whence she had fallen, and repented and did her first works, but like one who understood well what she did, gave her reasons for her return in a letter to father Tuberville, published a little after her death, in the second collection of Dr. Hickes's Controversial Letters.* The letter shows that she had well considered what she was about, and weighed the arguments on both sides, the only way of making a wise and safe retreat, in a matter of that vast consequence. And the reader will soon be satisfied that she had searched narrowly into that controversy, and has given such reasons for her return, as not only will justify it before all intelligent and impartial persons, but may be of very good use to others, that in the like circumstances shall duly attend to and make a right use of them. Nor are these all the works of hers that have been formerly published; though all that bear her name. For there was a piece of devotion that was printed in 1673, for Jonathan Edwin, entitled, "Daily Devotions, consisting of Thanksgivings, Confessions, and Prayer, by an humble penitent:" of which the beginning of the preface tells us, "they were the devotions of a learned pious Christian humbly offered up in due order." This little book met with such reception, that by the year 1703 it had a fifth edition. She wrote likewise "an Hexaemeron, or Meditations on the six Days of the Creation; Meditations and Devotions on the life of Christ."

What opinion that great man, Dean Hickes, had of this good lady has already partly appeared, but it would be unjust not

* Dr. Hickes says in his preface, that "she made herself as perfect in the controversy as English writers could make her, who managed the controversy on both sides." "I have," he adds, "above twenty Popish authors, which she left me, and some of them with marginal notes in her own hand. She was well versed in Bishop Morton's, Archbishop Laud's, and Mr. Chillingworth's works, and Rauchin's Review of the Council of Trent," &c.

to copy the eulogium which he bestows upon her in his preface to her "Devotions in the Ancient Way of Offices;"—"The author is one," says he, "whose house is a temple, and whose family is a church, or religious society, and whose hands are daily lifted up unto heaven, with alms, as well as prayers; one who religiously observes all the orders of the Church, and for the great ends for which they are enjoined; in a word, one who is a great example of Christian piety, and a singular ornament to our communion in this degenerate age; and among the many, and most serious good wishes I have for the Church of England, this is, and always shall be one, that all her sons and daughters were such."

Mrs. Hopton died at Hereford, in the eighty-second year of her age, July 12, 1709: and, according to her own appointment, she was interred near the remains of her husband, in the parish Church of Bishop's Frome, in the county of Hereford, where the following monumental inscription, written by Dr. Hickes, records her memory and worth.

"Next to the body of Richard Hopton, Esq. here lieth interred that of Susannah, his dear wife, who died July the 12th, 1709. She was a most loving and faithful wife, a most loyal subject, and a true daughter of the Church of England, as her printed Letter to Father Tuberville shows; a great example she was of devotion, as may be seen in her printed books: and of charity, particularly to the Clergy reduced by deprivation to poverty; to whom she left in trust 700l.* and under this stone she rests, in hopes of a blessed resurrection."

The beginning of Mrs. Hopton's last will and testament is too remarkable and excellent to be omitted in this account of her character.

"In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. Blessed be the holy and undivded Trinity, Amen. I, Susannah Hopton, of the city of Hereford, in the county of Hereford, widow, relict and executrix of Richard Hopton, Esquire, deceased, do make this my last will and testament, in manner and form following. First, I commend my soul to Almighty God the Father, my Creator, to Jesus Christ my Redeemer, and to the Holy Ghost, my Com-

* Her executor, Mr. Brome, informed Mr. Ballard, that she left 800l. to suffering clergymen. *Memoirs of British Ladies*, 8vo. 1775, p. 273.

forter and Illuminator, one God for ever. My body to the ground, to be decently buried near the remains of my deceased husband, in the Parish Church of Bishop's Frome, according to the order of the Church of England: in the Catholic communion of which Church I die; believing she holds the true Catholic faith according to the Scriptures, and Apostolical tradition interpreting them; the three creeds expressing these articles of faith, and the first four general councils explaining them."

As a specimen of the style of this exemplary woman, we shall close this memoir with a prayer taken from her "Devotions," which seems well adapted to the present times.

"O most-powerful and glorious Lord God, who by thy providence rulest and commandest all things, changing the times and the seasons according to thy will, and both setting up and pulling down whom thou pleasest, and who art a strong tower of defence at all times to all that flee unto thee. Stir up thy strength, we beseech thee, and come and help us, not for our own sakes, but for thy name's sake, which thou hast called upon us. For while some put their trust in chariots, and some in horses, we will remember the name of thee, O Lord our God, whose power no creature is able to resist, and who sittest in the throne judging right. Save us, therefore, and hear us, O King of Heaven, now we call upon thee: and suffer us not to sink under the weight of our sins, or the violence of the enemy. But arise and aid thy servants, who acknowledge thee the Lord of Hosts, confessing thee also the God of Peace: and make haste to put an end to the distractions and desolations of nations amongst whom thou has permitted evil angels to send a sword; that so there may be peace again upon the earth, and glory to thee in the highest, and we may all become the true children and disciples of peace; and both peace and happiness, with truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established, not only among us, but among all Christian nations, for all future generations: to the honour of thy great name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

For the Churchman's Magazine.

A Sermon, preached the 6th January, 1807, at the Consecration of St. John's Church, Hudson-Square, New-York: By the Rev. ISAAC WILKINS, *Rector of St. Peter's Church, West-Chester, and St. Paul's Church, East-Chester.*

1 Cor. iii. 17.—*If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy: for the temple of God is holy.*

THE Almighty God, the Father of heaven and earth, is an holy God!—He is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.—Nothing but holiness can dwell in his presence, or be admitted where he is.—The *universe* is his temple, *heaven* is his throne, and the *earth* his footstool. From *these* every thing that defileth must be removed—all impurity must be done away—all sin and iniquity, and the workers of them, must be destroyed. How then ought we miserable sinners, to tremble for *ourselves?* How ought we to tremble for a *world* that lieth in wickedness?

But blessed be God! we are not given over to despair. Though we have sinned—though we have defiled the temple of God, and exposed ourselves to the terrors of his judgments, we have hope through our Lord Jesus Christ. By faith in him, and through his blood, we are purified, and cleansed from our iniquity. He is the propitiation for our sins—He is made our righteousness. Through him the Holy Ghost is come upon us, sanctifying our souls, and making our bodies his temples: that we may be qualified for the presence of God; and through the infinite merits of our Redeemer, be enabled to dwell with him for ever.

Seeing then that we have been renewed to the image of God;—that we have been raised from a state of pollution—of sin, misery, and death, by the infinite wisdom and goodness of God;—that we are made the living temples of the Holy Ghost, through the mediation and intercession of the Redeemer—what manner of men ought we to be? To what holiness and purity, Christians! should we aspire? How cautiously, how circumspectly should we guard ourselves from all contamina-

tion and defilement, lest we grieve and offend the Holy Spirit—lest he leave us, and finally forsake us; and we be destroyed for ever?

We must remember, Christians! nor should we suffer the thought to be absent for a moment from our minds; that though renewed to a lively hope of salvation and glory, through the merits and intercession of our Redeemer, we are not without great danger—that we have of ourselves much to do—that we are in the midst of a polluted, a corrupting and fascinating world—that we have great and powerful enemies, both within and without, to contend with and overcome; and must therefore work out our salvation with fear and trembling.

The conflict we have to endure, is indeed trying and severe; and will require our utmost care and caution, and all our strength, power, and exertion: and our *great reward* is promised and assured to those only who shall continue it faithfully and unremittingly unto the end.

But difficult and arduous as is the warfare we are engaged in, we cannot fail of being victorious, if with due humility, and self debasement, we meekly submit ourselves, our minds, and wills, and understandings, to our Captain and our King; if yielding our hearts to him, we obediently keep his commandments, and implicitly submit to his ordinances and institutions; if with full faith and confidence in him, and in his Holy Spirit, we make constant and fervent *prayer* for his aid, and strength, and support.

This, every faithful soldier and follower of our blessed Redeemer is indispensably required to do; nor is it possible for him to succeed without it. He can have no power or ability, but what is derived to him from his Lord and Master. And the terms upon which they are assured, are *supplication* and *prayer*—the *prayer* of faith, and trust, and confidence—the *supplication* of meekness, resignation, and humility.

But as a soldier of Christ, he must not only consider himself as an *individual*, bound in his private capacity to exert himself to the utmost for his preservation: he must consider himself also of his church and kingdom. As a soldier of that great and united host, who under the banner of their Almighty leader, the everlasting Son of the Father, are waging war against the world, the flesh and the devil—restoring holiness,

and righteousness, and peace, and extirpating sin, and misery, and death, and every thing that defileth, from the creation and temple of God!

As such, therefore, he must make his exertions unitedly with them—his prayers and supplications must be offered in unison with theirs. And great and wonderful will be the effect of their joint operation; powerful beyond all human conception will they be, when offered up to the throne of grace, by our immaculate Intercessor, our Redeemer, and our God! and we may rest assured, that the gates of hell shall never prevail against us.

That we may unitedly offer up these our joint prayers and supplications to the Lord of hosts, we have on this day been consecrating to him *this house*, solemnly devoting it, and setting it apart to his service and worship. It is now the *temple of God!* And let us remember—*That if any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy: for the temple of God is holy.*

Can I say any thing more, my beloved fellow Christians, to induce you, at all times, and on every occasion, to reverence this *sacred place*, this holy temple of your Redeemer? Is then any thing more powerful, that can be urged to excite you upon this occasion, to glorify God—to offer up your praises and thanksgivings for this, and all his mercies—to make your prayers and supplications, that he would accept this offering to his name—that he would vouchsafe his presence in it—that he would sanctify both it and you—that he would give you the spirit of prayer and praise; of piety and devotion; of love and peace, and unity, and charity?

Great and manifold are the mercies of God, to us his unworthy creatures: nor is it among the least of them, that he hath enabled us to erect and dedicate temples to his name—to adorn and beautify them—and to render them in some measure worthy of his presence, and of his acceptance. It is to his superintending and watchful providence, (and it claims our warmest acknowledgment) that we owe the present means of doing it, and the will to do it. Let the sentiments of our hearts, therefore, correspond to these his undeserved favours. And having dedicated this house of stone and cedar to him, let us dedicate our souls and bodies also to his service. Let

us cleanse and purify ourselves in a manner becoming the temples of the Holy Ghost: So shall we worthily approach his altar; so shall we enter into the courts of his house, into *this his holy temple*, with innocence; so shall we avoid that guilt of pollution and defilement, against which the awful sentence of *destruction* is denounced.

The temple of God is holy!—Our bodies, Christians, are the temples of God! they are dedicated by baptism to his service; they are consecrated to his glory; they are the appropriated habitations of his Holy Spirit; they must therefore be kept pure and undefiled; they must be preserved from the pollutions of the world, from the corruptions of the flesh, from the contaminating influence of the evil one; or they must be destroyed—for the temple of God is holy.

This house, now dedicated to the service of God our Redeemer, must also be kept pure and undefiled. We must not approach it with unsanctified hearts and minds; we must not offer up in it the sacrifice of fools—a dead, a lame, or a diseased victim: but the best, the fairest, the firstling of our flock. We must not offer a cold, a careless, an unmeaning and unanimated worship, in which the heart, and mind, and affections bear no part; for this is defilement—it is an abomination to the Lord—it is destruction! Wilt thou dishonour thy governor by a worthless and affrontive offering? Or will he, a man, accept of such an offering at thy hand? And shall not God be avenged for such an insult as this?

This temple of God is holy—it is dedicated exclusively to his service. To employ it to any secular or worldly purpose, is a profanation of it. It must be filled with his glory alone; and all human glory must disappear in his presence. It must be kept pure and undefiled as his holy religion; it must be kept pure and undefiled as his holy name. There must be no mixture, no alloy in the gold of this his holy place. It must be sacredly, it must be peculiarly, it must be entirely devoted to him. Here nothing that is unclean must enter—here nothing must be heard but his holy word—but supplication and prayer—but thanksgiving and praise to him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever. Amen.

To defile the temple of our bodies is a sin of a private nature, and must and will assuredly be answered for by the individual.

But the defilement and profanation of the public temples of God involves in it a general and a public guilt: and whenever that *accursed thing* is found, we must fearfully look for a general and public infliction of punishment.

This subject, my fellow Christians, deserves your serious attention. Suffer me then, for a moment, to call your minds pointedly to it. Recollect, I beseech you—have not the holy temples of God, among us, been too frequently employed to secular and unhallowed purposes? Have they not been thoughtlessly and heedlessly profaned, by being diverted from their most sacred and appropriate use, to objects altogether unworthy of them, and contrary to that inviolable reverence and veneration that are due to them, and that ought to be paid them? Do not the various ways and instances in which this has been done occur to the minds of every one who hears me? or must I be under the painful necessity of pointing them out? I trust I need not: and I hope, that a sense of such impropriety, of such guilt and impiety, when only hinted to your minds, will induce a due remorse, and a firm resolution, carefully and religiously to avoid such profanation for the future.

But this is not all. Are not the temples of God and our Redeemer daily profaned by irreverent and unworthy offerings made by those who come to worship there? While they address him with their lips, are not their hearts and minds far from him? are not their thoughts and affections engaged by other objects? Is it not fully apparent that they are so, by the coldness, carelessness, and indevotion with which that worship is offered, and by which God is publickly dishonoured?

Are there not too many, who, standing in his presence, do not even vouchsafe to worship him with their lips—who, presenting themselves within his courts, bring no offering at all; neither ask his favour, deprecate his anger, nor thank, nor praise him for his goodness and mercy; who have not even *piety* or decency enough to reflect, for a moment, where they are, or in whose awful presence they stand? Is not this a defilement of God's holy place? And is not that defilement made doubly criminal in us, who have been so pre-eminently favoured by him with the most divine and heavenly form of public service that hath ever been bestowed upon his Church?

To great talents, blessings, and opportunities, great respon-

sibility is annexed. We, therefore, of this highly favoured Church, have much to answer for by our neglect and irreverent use of this unspeakable advantage, of this unmerited favour and grace of God; and we have every reason, upon that account, if there were no other, to apprehend his severest displeasure.

And have we not already begun to feel it? Is not the open and apparent want of zeal in us the avowed reason of thousands for separating from our communion; and the pretended cause at least of their animosity towards us? Is not the want of piety, and devotion, and animation, in our acts of public worship, when we assemble together before God, the just and merited reproach thrown out against us? A reproach, which, though it cannot justify them in their separation and hatred, we can in no wise repel; and which we never can do away, but by a return to that truly zealous and primitive fervour of piety and devotion, which so eminently distinguished the authors and compilers of our liturgy, and those grateful and animated Christians who at first received it at their hands, as the immediate gift and blessing of heaven.

The judgments of God, my brethren, are abroad upon the earth; and his warnings have extended to us. We have repeatedly felt the pressure of his hand; and I trust it has hitherto been laid upon us in mercy, to restore, and to heal. How soon, how speedily it may be lifted up to destroy, he who knoweth our hearts, and the good and evil that are in them, alone can tell. But it is a certain and awful truth, and worthy of your most serious regard, that the breach of his *sabbaths*, the neglect and irreverence of his *worship*, and the profanation and defilement of his *altars* and *temples*, have ever been, through all the dispensations of his providence, through all the forms of his government, the great and leading causes of his displeasure, and the most powerful calls of his justice and judgments upon the earth.

In this view, as a Christian Church, we have much to apprehend. We have great and crying sins, that call aloud for vengeance. But so morbid and deadly is the general state of spiritual insensibility into which we are fallen, that we seem almost incapable of perceiving our danger. We appear not to have even life enough left either to fear or to repent.

Yet, however general this fatal apathy may be, I trust it has not seized upon all. There are still thousands of zealous Christians left among us, whose unshaken faith, whose holiness and purity of life, whose piety and devotion will yet preserve us from a total and entire corruption; who may yet arrest the judgments of God, and prevent, as a Church, his giving us up to destruction.

Let me exhort you then, my fellow Christians, to reflect seriously upon your own state and condition, and upon the state and condition of your Redeemer's kingdom in this portion of it. And let it be your care, for it is your most bounden duty, your best interest, your highest glory, and it will prove your only safety, to endeavour to redeem the time that is past; and so to conduct yourselves in all things, that ye may become lights to this dark and degenerate age—that ye may extend and adorn your Redeemer's kingdom, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

(To be continued.)

RELIGIOUS MEDITATIONS.

(Continued from p. 184, and concluded.)

No. XXXV.

THE RESURRECTION.

1 Cor. xv. 35.—*But some man will say,* '*How are the* dead *raised up? and with* what body *do they come?*'—*Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die: and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but* bare grain; *it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain. But* God *giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this* corruptible *shall have put on* incorruption, *and this* mortal *shall have put on* immortality, *then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written,* Death is swallowed up in victory.—*O death, where is thy sting! O grave, where is thy victory! But, thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory, through* our Lord Jesus Christ.

MEDITATION.

WHY *should it be thought a thing incredible that* GOD *should raise the dead?* In *every seed*, which I sow in the earth, a change is wrought of the same nature with that change, which shall take place in the Resurrection of the Human Body. The corruption and decay of the original seed are necessary to the production of the future plant. That which I sow '*is not quickened except it die.*' I sow a naked lifeless seed, wholly different in outward appearance, and internal qualities, from the living herb, which *by experience* I know will spring from its dissolution. GOD provideth it another body; and raiseth from the seed a plant, endowed with qualities and properties; adapted to the state of existence, which, in his wisdom, he appoints it to fill. The Power which can raise up the blade and the ear from a buried and perishing grain of wheat, can call forth from the dust, in which man's mortal body is dissolved, a frame fit to partake of the inheritance of the Saints in light. HE can revive, under another form, the decayed flesh of man, and *for ever crown it with glory*, which it was incapable of sustaining before. Earth must return to earth, before it can be clothed with life eternal. But if, in this life, *I am renewed in the spirit of my mind, after the image of the* LORD *from Heaven*, when CHRIST, who is my life, shall appear, then shall I also appear with him in glory.*—Let me therefore be steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the LORD, for as much as I know that my labour is not in vain in the LORD.

No. XXXVI.

THE NEW JERUSALEM.

Revelations xxi. 10.—*And he carried me away, in the spirit, to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city the* HOLY JERUSALEM, *descending out of heaven from* GOD; *having the* GLORY OF GOD: *and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as*

* Colos. iii. 4.

crystal. And the twelve gates were twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl: and the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass. And I saw no temple therein: for the LORD GOD ALMIGHTY *and the* LAMB *are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for the* GLORY OF GOD *did lighten it, and the* LAMB *is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day; for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it. And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that* defileth, *neither whatsoever* worketh abomination, *or maketh a* lie; *but they which are written in the* LAMB'S BOOK OF LIFE.

MEDITATION.

Glorious things are indeed spoken of thee, O THOU CITY OF GOD.*—Thus does THE DIVINE BEING condescend to aid our feeble powers by sensible representations. But none of these things which are spoken can ever give us, while on earth, an adequate conception of those heavenly mansions. The pearls and the gems, the gold and the crystal, the honour of kings and of the nations they govern, all fall inconceivably short of that GLORY; for eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, what GOD hath prepared for them that love him.†—But who shall dwell in this his tabernacle? Who shall rest in this his holy hill? Even he that leadeth an uncorrupt life, and doeth the thing which is right, and speaketh the truth from his heart.‡—Nothing that *defileth*, nothing that *worketh abomination, or maketh a lie* (as I learn from St. John) shall ever approach these regions of perpetual day, and joy, and peace, and security: none but the pure and the pious, the humble and the holy, shall enter into this *Great Temple*, illuminated and enlightened for ever by the glorious and visible presence of GOD. Oh may I therefore earnestly pray that the LORD would form

* Psalm lxxxvii. 3. † 1 Cor. ii. 9. ‡ Psalm xv. 1, 2.

me by his GRACE, to *Purity*, *Humility* and *Godliness;* and never may the desire of sensual enjoyment turn my mind from contemplating this his glorious kingdom, or diminish in my heart the fervent desire of it. In the mean time, let me pray that he will conduct me through what path he pleaseth, so as it may lead to these habitations of light and glory; that he will determine for me, according to his divine will, in what abode I shall now dwell; so that I may at length arrive at the object of my earnest wishes, THE CITY AND TEMPLE OF GOD. *Amen and Amen!*

MEDITATION ON LIFE.

While *health*, and *strength*, and *youth* remain,
And pleasure flows, uncheck'd by pain;
May I, O Lord! my soul prepare,
By faith, by penitence, and prayer.

So, when the *snares of sin* are spread
Around my unsuspecting head;
Thy grace shall Satan's power control,
And from temptation guard my soul.

So when the *cares of life* molest,
And rob my doubting mind of rest;
Thy word shall bid the tempest cease,
And calm my anxious breast to peace.

So when my *youth* and *strength* decay,
And life's gay vision fleets away;
Eternal bliss my soul shall prove,
In realms of everlasting love.

MEDITATION ON DEATH.

When past the *painful toil* of day,
And the soft twilight fades away;
How sweet the wearied eye to close,
And gently sink in soft repose!

When *Storms*, and *Seas*, and *Dangers* past,
We gain the wish'd-for port at last;
How sweet to tread our native shore,
And each accustom'd haunt explore!

When pauses the discordant strife,
That breaks the harmony of life;
And *war's* shrill clarion doth cease,
How sweet the glad return of peace?

So when the *toil of life* is o'er,
And *strife* and *war* alarm no more;
How sweet the Christian's life to close!
How sweet in death to find repose!

To the Editor of the Churchman's Magazine.

REV. SIR,

I send you an extract of a Sermon, delivered at ——, *in Maryland, on the first Sunday after Easter; being the conclusion, addressed especially to those who had not participated in the Holy Eucharist on the preceding festival, as the discourse itself was chiefly exhortatory to communicants, to "walk in newness of life"—from* Rom. vi. 4. "*Therefore we are buried with him by baptism,*" &c.

The Guilt, Folly, and Danger of abstaining from the Holy Communion.

I CANNOT conclude, without an affectionate admonition to those who have not communicated. Though you have not, brethren, partaken of the Supper of the Lord, nor publicly and expressly renewed your covenant with God and Christ, yet still the vows of God are upon you. When you were dedicated to God by baptism, you were dedicated in the divinely prescribed way, and the cross which was signed on your forehead denoted, that "hereafter you should not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ, but manfully fight under his

banner, against sin, the world, and the devil, and continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant until your life's end." You would not be cut off from the privileges and benefits of the Christian covenant, both in this life and the next? You are bound then to fulfil the conditions upon which they are graciously promised and vouchsafed to men—*repentance, faith, and obedience;* in other words, by walking in that newness of life which the Apostle recommends in the text, and which is uniformly required in the whole of sacred writ. You see then, whether you receive this Holy Sacrament or not, you are already engaged and solemnly devoted to God; and if you renew not this self dedication by special acts from time to time, you evidence your own remissness and want of thought, and the loss is all your own. What do you then by abstaining from the table of the Lord, and refusing that holy banquet to which God himself invites you in the Gospel? You slight the love of your heavenly Father; you disobey your blessed Saviour's last command, "Do this in remembrance of me;" you refuse to commemorate his death and sacrifice, through which alone you can have any hopes of eternal life; you neglect the most excellent and powerful means of grace and salvation; you declare that you care not for communion either with God or your Christian brethren. You do, in effect, make light of Christ and salvation; and that with the same preposterous folly and madness with which those who were invited declined attending the marriage feast in the gospel. You make light of *him* who did not make light of you, when you deserved his final neglect of you. You make light of that, in comparison of which all earthly things are as a drop of a bucket, or as the small dust of the balance—You make light of your own salvation and everlasting welfare! You make light of that gospel which you profess to believe, by disregarding one of its most prominent and inestimable institutions! You, in fact, give preference to the trifling vanities of this life above the never ending realities of the life to come, and declare yourselves the servants of mammon rather than the servants and children of the Most High God! You virtually renounce all interest in your Redeemer—for you cannot be insensible, that those that honour him, he will honour; but they that despise him, shall be lightly esteemed: "whosoever shall deny him before men,

him will he also deny before his Father in heaven." In fine, you make yourselves easy and careless about him, without whose mediation and most gracious favour and assistance you neither can be prepared to meet death nor judgment, to enjoy the religious comforts of this life, nor the glories of the next!

You cannot, brethren, destroy the covenant of the Lord your God; though you may easily sin against it, and forfeit all its benefits:—you cannot change the word which the Lord hath spoken, nor prevent his holiness and faithfulness, his justice and truth. Suppose yourselves absolved from the baptismal engagements which were made in your infancy! you cast yourselves out of the Church of Christ, and reduce yourselves to the situation of those unbelievers and wicked doers, against whom "the Queen of the South and the men of Ninevah shall rise up in judgment, and condemn them." It may be said of you, as to Chorazin and Bethsaida of old, "Wo unto you! wo unto you! for if the mighty works which have been done in you had been done in Tire and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes."—You have had the full offer of salvation, and the means of grace; and have slighted them all!

Are there any of you who have once been in the practice of communicating, but of late have neglected it? I must speak to you in the language of our Lord to the angel of the Church of Ephesus, "Remember from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent."

To all of you, my brethren, I would, with the greatest seriousness of heart say, as my duty requires, that it highly becomes you, as you value your own best interest, and would not be lost for ever, to study from henceforth to live in all respects as becometh the gospel of Christ—in conformity to all the commandments, all the institutions of your Lord and Saviour; to put off the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness;—to be no longer the servants of sin, but yield your members, your faculties both of body and mind, "as instruments of righteousness unto God;" that being dead unto sin, ye may be alive unto God, and "being

buried with Christ by baptism into death," ye may be "planted together with him in the likeness of his resurrection;"—"remembering always," as our liturgy expresses it, "that baptism doth represent unto us our profession, which is, to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto him; that as he died and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living."

Now to God the Father, who hath created us, to God the Son, who hath redeemed us, and God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth the faithful, be ascribed, as is most due, by men on earth, as by angels in heaven, all honour, might, majesty, and dominion, now, henceforth, and for ever. Amen.

[*We invite the attention of our readers to the following treatise. It relates to some religious topics that are frequently, and with interest, discussed among Christians. Mr. Knox, the author, was a* Presbyterian *Minister, and resided for several years in this country, but afterwards removed to the West-Indies, and died on the island of St. Croix. In the following republication of his letter, the introduction, and some other sentences are omitted which were not essential to the argument; and a note to the introduction is incorporated with the letter.*]

A Letter to the Rev. Mr. JACOB GREEN, *of New-Jersey, pointing out some Difficulties in the Calvinistic Scheme of Divinity, respecting* FREE WILL, DIVINE DECREES, PARTICULAR REDEMPTION, *&c. and requesting a Solution of them. By* HUGH KNOX, *Minister of the Gospel in the Island of Saba, in the West-Indies.*

[Continued from p. 200.]

AS to what you say of *promises to the unregenerate.* You will not, I suppose, dispute that there are many *absolute* and *unconditional* promises made to such, because the whole scripture

is full of them ;* and that a poor sinner *may* and *ought* to plead these as well as he can in prayer. Indeed, many have gone so far as to deny that there are any *proper conditions* belonging to the covenant of grace ; and to say that the gospel is nothing but a *pure*, *unconditional promise* to sinners. The question is, I presume, about *conditional promises to unconverted sinners ;* upon the performance of which conditions they are entitled, by the gracious appointment of GOD, to those influences of his spirit, which are *efficacious*, *converting*, and *saving :* Whether, in short, GOD hath made any gracious promises to the *doings* or *exercises* of persons in a state of unregeneracy ?—The answer to this question will, I apprehend, depend much upon that to the former ; to wit—" Whether unregenerate men, as such, can do any thing *spiritually good*, or *acceptable* to GOD?" For, if this can be granted in the affirmative ; if it be allowed that GOD by his spirit *can* or *does*, in any measure, influence the hearts of unregenerate men, and dispose them to good ; I cannot see it " inconsistent that GOD should make promises to such exercises" as are the *fruits* and *effects* of his own blessed spirit. I cannot but think it strange that Christian divines are so cautious in distinguishing between what they call the *common* and *special* operations of the *same divine agent.* Nor can I conceive the reason of the mighty danger they apprehend in allowing, that a sinner may be sometimes under divine influences, and may *in some measure* comply with them, before the moment of his regeneration ; or that GOD may oblige himself, by his own gracious promise, to *hear* and *answer* those cries and groans, which are excited by his own spirit.† Does it not

* Ezek. xi. 19.—xxxvi. 26, &c. Jerem. xxxii. 39, &c.

† You say, in your last letter, that " while men think they are doing that which does lay God under obligations, even though it be by his own gracious appointment, they will never be those humble souls that submit to and receive the grace of the gospel."—I humbly hope, *my dear Sir*, that you dropped this uncharitable sentence inadvertently. A sentence by which all persons of my sentiments, *Arminians*, *Methodists*, and others, are cut off from all possibility of ever submitting to or embracing the gospel salvation. Let me put only this single case to your charity. The Rev. Mr. *John Wesley* and *brother*, are supposed at this time to have under them not less than 500 preachers, in *England*, *Ireland*, and *Scotland*. By a modest computation then, there are not fewer than 60,000 *Wesleans* in these three kingdoms, all zealous of Mr. *Wesley's* peculiar tenets, and yet, in a judgment of charity, generally very *pious* and *devout* men, abounding in the visible fruits of godliness. All these men as *Wesleans*, hold the sentiment here advanced, and are in all respects much more *Arminians* in opinion than I am ;—and yet will you venture to suppose, that *not one soul* of these 60,000 persons is " such an humble soul as hath received and submitted to the

sufficiently secure the whole honour of our salvation to GOD, as his own proper work, to believe and be persuaded that corrupt man can do nothing *spiritually good of himself;* nothing *acceptable to* GOD without the influences of his sanctifying spirit;—that all his endeavours, so far as they are *properly his*, are of no account, of no avail with GOD, but *are*, and *must be* wholly displeasing to him; "being no other than the exertions of that carnal mind, which is enmity against GOD;" and that even when GOD *first* works, freely and graciously works upon the soul, the good things which the sinner does in consequence of such operation, have in them no proper merit to *oblige* GOD; being not the *sinner's own*, but GOD's;—and that whatever promises GOD makes to *these exercises*, are, if I may so speak, *unobliged*, *unconstrained*, *unmerited* by the sinner, and arising *purely* and *wholly* from GOD's own merciful nature? Yet these exercises, partaking of the nature of *holiness*, and being the fruits and effects of *holy influences*, there is a congruity and fitness in supposing that GOD should *favourably regard* them, and *encourage* and *reward* them by *farther degrees* of his grace and favour; according to that gospel declaration—*unto him that hath shall be given.*

Nor can I conceive any *merit* (which can render this doctrine *suspected* or *frightful*, as though it tended to depreciate free grace, and exalt human merit) in complying with an external force or impression; or in being led where the spirit gently draws; or in not resisting an impression to the utmost of our power;—though I can conceive a *great deal of demerit* and *guilt* in continuing to resist, oppose, grieve, and quench the same divine agent who would seal sinners to the day of redemption. What divines call a *law-work*, or a preparatory work to conversion, supposes that the Holy Spirit is thus sometimes very long at work on the hearts of sinners; and the *va-*

grace of the gospel; or, as hath ever, in a right manner, submitted to God's method of salvation."—I know you will not. The chief ground for charity to *Arminians* from Calvinists, goes upon a favourable supposition that their *hearts* may be better than their *heads;* or, that while they plead for *Arminian doctrines*, they may be tinctured with *Calvinistic principles*. But I imagine this will be found too dubious a foundation whereon to build the noble structure of Christian charity: since *as* the *head* is, upon solid scriptural conviction, *such* will the *heart* and *principles* be. So that, if we cannot have charity for a man's principles, I can see no reason why we ought to have it for his person. The whole scheme of Arminian principles I *never could*, and I believe, *never shall* adopt; yet I dare not exclude a man of these principles from my charity.

rious steps of this work which experienced Christians have described seem to prove that they have, in some respects, complied with his operations, before the *happy moment* of regeneration, when he took a *full* and *abiding* possession of their souls. If the character described, Rom. vii. is, as many have supposed, that of an unregenerate man, *first* ignorant of the law, and *then* enlightened and convicted by it, and continuing under a legal spirit of bondage, until at length he is regenerated and transported with the discovery of gospel grace and liberty, it will fully confirm the truth of the opinion I plead for. We may surely discover some marks of real grace in that character; such as "an approbation of the law of GOD, as holy, just, good, and spiritual; a delight in it, after the inward man; a will to good, and the like:"—yet this very person declares that he is *carnal, sold under sin;* that *in his flesh dwelleth no good thing*—and complains—*O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death!*

If we suppose that there are no promises of grace made to the *unregenerate*, it would seem to follow that they have *no encouragement* to seek grace, nor to use any means for obtaining it; more especially if what Mr. *Hopkins* says be true, "that all such means necessarily make sinners *worse* and *more guilty*, before conversion;* and the best thing that unconverted sinners can do, on this supposition, seems to be, to neglect all means of obtaining conversion, as *needless*, yea, *hurtful*, and wait with folded hands the moment of regeneration; confident that GOD will provide food and nourishment for his children as soon as they are born. This sounds like *Sandimanism*, and contradicts those express commands to unconverted sinners—*strive to enter in at the strait gate—turn ye, turn ye—cast away from you all your transgressions, and make you a new heart—repent ye therefore, and be converted*," &c. Sure these commands to unconverted sinners imply *something* that they may be enabled to do, and ought to do, in order to the end proposed; and *which* if they do, they have reason to hope for success. If it be said that these commands are sufficient encouragement to put sinners upon the use of means, I answer, a command to perform a duty can give no encouragement to

* Sermons on the knowledge of the law and regeneration. Pages 54, &c.

attempt it, unless the person commanded be either supposed to have POWER to perform it, or has a *promise* of *help* and *assistance* if he attempts it. Whereas it is supposed, in the present case, that the persons commanded are not only without any power to perform the commanded duty; but that even their *attempts* and *endeavours* to obtain *this power* from another must necessarily render them the more guilty and sinful; that is, must remove them farther from this power than ever. It would follow then, that GOD, by enjoining these commands upon unregenerate sinners, sets them upon the certain means of increasing their guilt and condemnation.

The command of a superior cannot be deemed equitable, where the *commanded inferior* has not a power of obeying; unless such inferior has criminally lost this power, by his *own fault*. Wherefore all GOD's commands to his impotent creatures imply a promise of assistance to all who ask it, and attempt obedience in consequence; otherwise his commands would not be equitable. To illustrate this give me leave to put the following case. You are a *master*, and have a number of *slaves*, who, being your property, are subject to all your lawful commands. You say to one go, and he goeth; to another come, and he cometh, &c. Among these your slaves are a *father* and a *son*. The father breaketh the son's leg. Knowing the accident, you repair to the lame young slave, and lay your authoritative command on him to go on an errand. The slave answers, "I cannot, master, my father has broken my leg." To this you reply, "I have not lost my *right of commanding*, because you have lost your *power of obeying*—you ought not to have become impotent—the command is lawful in itself—it is fit and right that a *slave* should do his *master's* errands; wherefore go directly whither I command you, or you shall be severely chastized." To this the impotent lad—"True, master, the command may be right in itself, but to me it is impossible. I pray, have my leg cured, or get me a wooden leg, or let one assist me, and I will go whither thou commandest." —Would we deem such a command *equitable* without such assistance? How much *less* so still, could we suppose the master so to have *ordered*, *appointed*, and *predisposed* things, as that the father must *necessarily* and *unavoidably* break his son's leg; and that to illustrate some dispositions of his, which he would

have made known to the whole family?—promises of assistance are, therefore, necessarily implied in all GOD's commands to unregenerate sinners of *Adam's* race.

Encouragement and *hope* must be founded on some *divine promise* or *declaration.* GOD must *cause* us to hope, or we can have no ground to encourage us to hope; and the ground of this hope, must be *his word.* If then there be no ground of hope in GOD's word to encourage the prayers and endeavours of unregenerate sinners, they can have no encouragement either to *pray* or *endeavour;*—not even to say, "*Lord be merciful to me a sinner;*—or, *help, Lord, else I perish.*"—You say, "you are a poor unrenewed sinner," and ask, "what you shall do?" I tell you to pray for a new heart, to pray for the regenerating grace of GOD, and to be found in the diligent use of all the appointed means of grace. "To what purpose pray; say you, God hath never promised to *hear* or *answer* the prayers of an unregenerate sinner: he *cannot:* it is inconsistent: besides, all my endeavours to *enter in at the strait gate* are not only unavailable, but also offensive to GOD, and will only aggravate my guilt."—Suppose, *my dear Sir*, that one of the sinners of your congregation should *thus* address *you;* would you not instantly set him upon *praying*, *striving*, and *endeavouring*, with *hope of success* in the use of means?—would you not show him the grounds of a sinner's hope, from the word of GOD? would you not more particularly point out to him those cheering and exhilarating words of the LORD *Jesus*, so well adapted to such a case as his. (Luke xi. 9—13). *I say unto you, ask, and it shall be given you: seek, and ye shall find: knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh receiveth: and he that seeketh findeth: and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened. If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?* In the illustration of which fine and comfortable passages of scripture, I beg leave to borrow the words of a *pious*, *amiable* and *reputedly orthodox divine*, who, by the bye, is no friend to *Arminian* principles. "All who enjoy the gospel have reason to expect the neces-

sary assistance of the spirit. *Our heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him;*—to *all that ask him.* Luke xi. 13. Nor must it be said, that we can't ask aright. No doubt we are capable of such asking as is required, and made the condition of our receiving; otherwise here was a promise, and no promise; a promise to make us despair, rather than encourage us. I don't pretend to solve all difficulties here; but the notions GOD has taught us to entertain of himself, of his justice, wisdom, mercy and goodness; the declarations he has made of himself in his word, assure us that he *will not, does not*, lay our salvation upon things *absolutely out of our own reach.* Whatever weakness, impotency and inability we are under by reason of the fall, a sufficient remedy is provided through a Mediator. And when GOD has appointed us so many duties, all tending to our advantage, and promised to assist us therein, and to give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him, we *must* conclude these duties *are possible*, and that the necessary assistance shall not be denied; otherwise we make him *a hard master, reaping where he has not sown, and gathering what he has not strowed.* In short, none shall perish for want of necessary assistance on GOD's part: none can justly say, though they sinned, they could not help it;—nor shall be able to say in hell, that though they are damned, they could not help it. Such a plea would afford a relief the place of torment does not admit of; would cool the tongues of the damned, and, in a great measure, quench the flames of the burning lake. *All there* will be convinced that GOD was *real*, not only in his *threatnings*, but also in his *promises* of *grace* and *help.* And this conviction will render them utterly defenceless, fill them with silent horror; and, when under the just sentence of GOD, leave them for ever speechless. Matt. xxii. 12."*

(To be concluded in the next No.)

* *Bennet's* Christian Oratory, edit. 4. vol. i. p. 380.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

[*Distinguished, as we are persuaded the communications of the writer of the following essay will always be by excellence and correctness both of sentiment and style, we feel a pleasure in promising to our readers the gratification of his correspondence.*]

THE SUPERIOR EXCELLENCE OF CHRISTIAN MORALITY.

THE term *morality*, when employed by one whose principles are not well known, is, by many devout persons, regarded with distrust and jealousy. Nor is this to be wondered at; for one of the means employed to advance the cause of infidelity, has been, to exalt *morality* at the expense of *religion*. And as names have a greater effect upon the generality of mankind than things themselves, the words *morality* and *moral* have been in various ways diverted from their proper and original use, and applied to the purposes of the most worthless of the human race. Late years have produced unnumbered swarms of *moral* discourses, *moral* essays, *moral* tales, in short, *moral* writings of every description, tending to subvert the distinctions of right and wrong, to corrupt all purity of thought and manners, and to destroy the very foundations of honour and virtue.

But of all the evils which our religion has to encounter, none are perhaps more dangerous than the examples of those whom the world in general styles *moral men;* that is, men who maintain a reputation for strict morality, without paying any regard to the doctrines or external forms of religion. And indeed many persons appear to glide on prosperously through life, in the performance of their duties towards their fellow men, who are never seen to offer any prayer or praise to their Maker, nor heard to express any veneration or love for his power and goodness.

The Christian, whose faith is not well informed, when he beholds a person of the above description, naturally asks himself, " Of what use is religion, if a man may lead a life so pure,

so useful, and so happy, with no other guides than the laws of morality?" But if any one who understands the nature of our religion will compare it with the moral systems which acknowledge no other source than the light of nature and reason, he may clearly perceive that all morality which is not founded upon the gospel must be liable to great and dangerous imperfections. For, if revelation be altogether disregarded, the moralist must labour under the same uncertainty and difficulty with the natural philosopher; the knowledge which either can attain, must be the result of observation and experience; the elementary and fundamental principles upon which their respective systems rest, must be investigated by a laborious process of reasoning from effects to causes; and after all that human industry and ingenuity can perform, the conclusions at which unassisted reason arrives, as well in morals as in natural philosophy, are often doubtful and contradictory, and the application of them, in many cases, difficult or impossible.

How would natural philosophers rejoice if they could arrive at the knowledge of the elementary laws of nature! They would then be spared all the labour of minute and tedious experiments, of incessant observation, and of perplexing comparisons; their toil would then be converted into amusement and delight, they might look with the eye of understanding upon all the phenomena of nature, they might predict her most sudden changes, and be able to imitate her most complex operations.

Now, in the moral world, Christianity has brought to light that very discovery which is an object of such eager desire to those who study the works of nature. The gospel has revealed to us the fundamental rules of all moral action; rules so concise and simple, that they are level with the weakest capacity, yet so accurate and comprehensive that they may be applied to every state and condition. By the aid of these few divine principles the whole conduct of man, as a moral agent, is easily regulated, and no moral phenomenon occurs which may not be readily explained. It is evident, therefore, that he who acts under the guidance of Christian morality, must proceed with more certainty and self-satisfaction than can possibly be enjoyed by him who is regulated by the dictates of mere human wisdom.

The infidel moralist resembles a person who has learned to speak a language by habit, and converse with society; he may, in general, speak with propriety, and even with elegance, but he is ever liable to commit mistakes; and, if any difficulty occur, he is at a loss to determine between right and wrong. The Christian moralist, on the contrary, is like one who understands the grammatical structure and philosophy of his language, and who, of course, can give a reason for what he says, and is never at a loss how to express himself with propriety.

To the view of a superficial observer, there is something very specious and imposing in the pretensions of these irreligious moralists. They profess to be calm and unprejudiced observers of mankind, not confined to the contemplation of any one society of men, nor to the study of any particular set of doctrines; and finding themselves at a loss how to choose among the various religious systems which prevail in the world, and which are maintained with equal pertinacity by their respective adherents, they declare themselves content to take up with that morality which is professed by every sect, and which is nearly the same throughout mankind. But this reasoning is as false as it is specious; and would these wide-ranging inquirers but condescend to examine a little more profoundly, they might soon perceive the fallacy of their opinions. To a distant beholder, the productions of the vegetable world offer little variety, their foliage and flowers seem promiscuously mingled, they are all brightened and invigorated by the same sun, and they are all refreshed and nourished by the same dews and showers; but a nearer examination teaches that some are fragrant and beautiful, others noxious and deformed; some salutary and palatable, others poisonous and disgusting; some vigorous and lasting, others feeble and transient.

But let the very best of those moral men who reject religion be actually examined, and it will be found that their virtue is not of that glowing and exalted character which commands the admiration and conciliates the affection of the virtuous, and extorts the respect while it thwarts the measures of the vicious. They are not men who feel and express unqualified detestation at the view of villany however brilliant or successful. Their attachment to virtue does not manifest itself in an ardent and zealous love, but bears the appearance of no more than a cold

and deliberate approbation. They sometimes possess much gentleness of manner and generosity of mind, yet they are not the persons to whom an afflicted soul, conscious of its immortality, would desire to have recourse for support and consolation. In short, the mere moralist is ignorant of the origin and spirit of the laws by which he is guided; for true morality is but a part of one great system; it is the superstructure of an edifice whose foundations lie deep and immoveable. The Christian must be moral, or he violates the rules of his profession; and while he practises morality, he understands its real nature and design; he takes into view not only its present, but its future and eternal benefits.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

(From a Correspondent.)

A Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.

[Continued from page 215.]

4. *Of Grace.*

THE Calvinists and the Arminians agree in affirming, that the disorders of our nature can be healed only by the grace of God; which begins and brings to perfection whatever is holy and acceptable to God, in man. But the Calvinists say, that saving grace is given only to the elect; in whom it is irresistible and efficacious. The Arminians hold that grace is bestowed on all; that it is sufficient for their salvation; but that it acts suasively and may be resisted.

The principal question, then, coming before us, is that of resistible or irresistible influence of the Holy Ghost, in conversion. Now the epistle does not contain any thing which has ever been alleged to be a direct affirmation, concerning his holy influence, in that business. We are indeed told of "the spirits helping our infirmities," and of his "making interces-

sion for us." And it is not denied to be reasonable, to argue analogically, that he must exercise an agency over the mind, in the matter now the subject. But as even this is not directly affirmed in the epistle; much less can it be expected, that there should be found in it any metaphysical distinctions, as to the manner of his operation.

There may, however, be supposed something to the same effect, in those expressions which intimate a call to Christians; since the very address is to persons "called to be saints;" or as the margin has it more literally, to "called saints." And so, the foreknown and predestinated are "called," before they are "justified." Here, it is common to make a distinction, between an outward calling by the ministry of the word and an inward calling by the spirit. Now it is far from being intended to be said in this place, that the latter is unconcerned, in bringing sinners home to God. But it is affirmed, that, be the sense of scripture what it may in this matter; it has nothing to do in establishing the meaning of the expression; which ought not to be supposed to have different meanings, in different parts of the epistle. For when it is said in the 11th chap. "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance;" this applying to the Jews, who were cut off because of their unbelief and pointing to their being taken in again; it is evident, that the word "called," to whatever extent it may imply individual application, is used collectively by the Apostle; and that, in whatever degree, it may in its consequences extend to another life, it is here intended of a visible profession in the present. If so, whatever weight there may be in the distinction between a general and an effectual call, there can be no foundation for it in the word itself; which has no relation to any other call, than that intimated in this epistle, where it is said—"How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent?"

There is something further, however, to be said of grace, as it respects good works; and of the relation in which the two subjects stand to one another. It is well known, that there have been entertained some opinions, ascribing merit to human works; and thus, detracting from the freedom of the grace of God: And to these opinions, there is generally opposed the

doctrine held by Protestants, of justification by faith alone. Now it has been argued against the representing of our acceptance as dependent on the co-operation of our endeavours, that this detracts from the freedom of the grace; making the effect in some degree dependent on our works. It is foreign to the present design, to go fully into this question. Nothing more is exacted, than a proof, that the controverted matter handled by the Apostle was of a different description from that which has become familiar in modern controversy; that no determination of this can be gathered from reasonings concerning the other; and that therefore, how far the affirming of the co-operation of man is an invasion of the prerogative of sovereign grace, must be left to other authorities of scripture, in entire independence on the book before us.

It is the 4th chapter only, in which this subject has been supposed treated of, in any extent: and in order to form a correct idea of the reasoning of the Apostle in that place, there will be a use in noticing a clear distinction between merit strictly speaking, on the part of the creature; and the claiming of debt from the Creator, as the result of the binding operation of his own gracious promise. When St. Paul says, in another book of scripture (Heb. vi. 10,) "God is not unrighteous, to forget your work and labour of love;" it ought not to be considered as lessening the free grace of the reward; but only as making it claimable, in virtue of unmerited declaration. So, when it is said in the passage that is now to meet our notice—"To him that worketh, is the reward reckoned, not of grace but of debt;" there cannot be supposed the declaration, which would be contrary to the immensity of the divine perfections, that in the unsinning keeping of the whole law, supposing it were possible, there can be a ground of the claim of merit: And it would be inconsistent with the admonition of our blessed Saviour, that, when we have done all, we must say—"we are unprofitable servants."

What then is the debt, implied by the Apostle to be brought forward by the advocates of Judaism, but denied by him? It can be no other, than the kind of debt referred to just now, in the Epistle to the Hebrews; supposed to be attached to the laws of the Mosaic œconomy. And if we consider the reasons on which the Apostle denies this debt; and still more, the

consequence which had been drawn from it of the perpetual obligation of the law; and most of all the effect of the principle on the condition of the Gentile converts; the present part of the subject will be set in a sufficiently perspicuous point of view.

The first argument used, is, that Abraham, who was to be "a Father of many nations;" that is, who was taken into a state of covenant designed to embrace those many, coming under him to the inheritance of it; was justified with God, before he was placed under the covenant referred to; (v. 5.) "his faith being counted to him for righteousness:" his faith, considered as contrasted with works done in obedience to a covenanting law; and having no reference to a work, so far as it is morally good in itself and in its motive. Accordingly, St. James consistently considers the offering of Isaac as a work; although, on the plan of reasoning of St. Paul, it was an act of faith, in another sense of the expression. And here, by the way, there may be propriety in noticing the extraordinary use made of the part of the passage now before us, in the doctrine of what is called the imputed righteousness of Christ. The favourers of this doctrine bring in proof of it, what first the history of the Old Testament and afterwards an Apostle mention, as imputed to a man's self: imputed, certainly, by the free grace of God, although it be not expressly said so. If it be replied, that all grace of God is through Christ, this will not be denied; although it will be contended, that the manner in which the grace is conferred is foreign to the present subject. But to return to the Apostle's argument. The way in which it applies to the purpose, is, as he expresses himself on the same subject in another epistle, (Gal. iii. 17.) that "the promise, confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect;" or render it less favourable to the many nations, than it had been before; in relation to the freedom of the interest which they were to obtain in it.

Another consideration brought to the same effect, is in the temporary duration of the law; which the Apostle does not here go fully into the proof of, as in the Epistle to the Galatians; but rather seems to point to it, as a necessary conse-

quence of the dispensation to Abraham; which had been the foundation of all that followed. However, he unequivocally affirms the fact; comparing the circumstances in which the Jewish people had stood, as to the law, to a marriage contract; which is no longer binding, than during the lives of both the parties.

But the Apostle has another argument and that going directly to the present point, in the very nature of the law itself; which was exclusive of every idea of there being created a debt on the part of the law-giver: and the reason was the law's condemning sentence on the irregular propensities of our nature. For this must be supposed intended (v. 15.) in the saying of "the law's working wrath:" and when it is added "where no law is, there is no transgression;" this must be taken agreeably to the concise writing characteristic of the Apostle; meaning that the prohibition and the penalty of the law exhibit in the strongest point of view the enormity of irregular desire; while, even without them, there could not but be an apprehension of the crime.

Now, let there be observed the way, in which the argument is brought to bear on the point before us. Had the Apostle been reproving any such arrogance of the Jewish Christians, as consisted in the plea of actual merit in the sight of God; there was no occasion to have had recourse to such a recondite sense of the law, as that stated. Had they been adopting the language of the ostentatious Pharisee in the Gospel—"God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are;" he might have shown to them from the same Gospel, that, were their obedience as perfect as they erroneously supposed, they would have done no more than it was their duty to have done. And he might even have asked them from those ancient scriptures which they highly valued—"If thou be righteous, what givest thou him? Or what receiveth he of thine hand? Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art, and thy righteousness may profit the Son of man." In short; had such been the prejudice, to which the reasonings of the Apostle were opposed; he would have hardly been found treating it as a mental error; but would more probably have assumed the tone, suited to an immoral state of mind.

But no: the Jewish Christians supposed, that the divine

Being had assumed—if it may be related without presumption —the obligation of his own act, in the law instituted by the ministry of Moses. With the giving of this law, he had entered into a covenant with their nation, under its seals, instituted by himself. And therefore they inferred, that the new covenant, which they had seen established by omnipotence, must be designed to co-exist with the obligations of the old. In contradiction of this error, the Apostle shows, that the new covenant was recognized in one older than the Mosaic; even in the Abrahamic; that the Mosaic was never designed to be other than temporary; and that, even during its continuance, it could give no claim; because it showed, more conspicuously than would otherwise have appeared, the imperfection of all those services of men; the claim of which, if there be any, must therefore rest on other grounds, than what could be found established by the law. All this is pertinent. But to suppose that the Apostle, in order to determine a controversy of a local nature and to be judged of with the help of circumstances peculiar to a certain plea, should move, as relative to it, a question intimately connected with Christian morals and regarding all mankind; and not only so, but that in order to establish his sense of it, he should travel in circuitous argument, when he might come directly to the conscience and to the heart; is a proceeding, of which very strong evidence should appear, to convince us of it in such a writer as St. Paul. But if, in the whole thread of the discourse, there be not a sentence showing, that the writer designed to speak on the one or on the other side of any question concerning merit inherent to human works; or concerning the share which the human will may be supposed to take in the performance of them; it does not appear, that the decisions of the Apostle, in the places referred to, can with any propriety be introduced into the controversy contemplated in this book.

5. *Of Perseverance.*

The impossibility of falling finally from grace is what the Calvinists affirm and the Arminians deny. The object here is to prove, that the epistle has nothing to the purpose of either of the parties.

In favour of the doctrine, there are not recollected more than two passages adduced. The first of them, are the last two verses of the 8th chapter—" For I am persuaded, neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Be it confessed, that none of them can separate, in the important matter mentioned: But may not a man be so separated by his voluntary apostacy? That he may not, does by no means follow. It is analogous to a case easily supposed; that of a man, whose right to civil citizenship should be called in question. We may conceive of ourselves as advocating it, on the ground of constitution and law. In so doing, we might properly advert to all the machinations of his opponents; and then affirm, in the warmth of our attachment to his cause, that neither this man, nor another—and so on, mentioning every one of those whose malice we were defying, should deprive our client of his privilege. But it would not follow, nor would we design to affirm, that he might not forfeit it by treason, or lose the benefit of it by expatriation.

The other passage is in the 29th verse of the 11th chapter; where we read—" The gifts and calling of God are without repentance." Now, even if these words had been spoken of men in their individual capacities; it would not follow, that there might not be a forfeiture of their calling, by apostacy on their part; although they could not lose it by repentance on the part of God. But in truth, the words are intended of the Jews, in their collective capacity; and express, that, although in their character of a nation, they were now cast off, yet their original calling stood firm, insuring their being brought in again.

On the part of the Arminians, there has been adduced the passage of which the last quoted words are part; to show, that persons once in a state of acceptance with God, may be finally rejected by him: because, say they, certain, who were in existence at the time of the casting off, died in their unbelief; before the bringing in again; which will not happen, until " the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in." Still, the matter affirmed was of the nation; leaving the case of the individual as it was before.

There ought to be noted, in this place, the ground on which the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints is here considered as a branch of Calvinism. It does not appear to have been the opinion of Calvin, in the extent in which it is now received; and in which it was declared by the Synod of Dort, here adopted as the standard of the opinions of the parties.

Still, it is conceived, not to have been, in its present extent, the sentiment of Calvin himself. He treads carefully in the steps of St. Austin; who reconciled his doctrine of predestination with that of defectibility; by saying, that to others than the elect God might give all grace, except of perseverance. Agreeably to this Calvin says in his institutions (book ii. chap. v. sec. 3)—"Neither is it from any other cause (meaning than the grace of God) that some persevere to the end, while others fall in the course begun: Forasmuch as perseverance itself is the gift of God, which he does not bestow promiscuously on all, but imparts it as seems good to him. If the reason of the difference be demanded, why some constantly persevere and others fall through instability; no other reason appears to us, than that God sustains the former with a strength effected by his own energy, lest they should perish; and that to the latter he does not furnish the same support, to the end that they may be examples of inconstancy."

He also affirms the regeneration of infants in the ordinance of baptism. For speaking of their case, he says (book iv. chap. xvi. sec. 4)—"The promise, in which we have explained the virtue of the sign to be, is one in each (circumcision and baptism) namely, the fatherly favour of God, remission of sins and eternal life." In the 20th section, speaking of future repentance and faith, he says—"Which, although they are not formed in them, yet is the seed of each hidden in them, by a secret operation of the Spirit." And he concludes the chapter thus—"Wherefore, unless we would throw a cloud over the beneficence of God, we are to offer to him our infants; to whom he has assigned a place among his friends and domestics; that is, the members of his Church."

That there is an inconsistency between the doctrine of baptismal regeneration and that of the final perseverance of the Saints as now held by Calvinists, need not be proved. Nevertheless it must be confessed, that Calvin held the latter doc-

trine, as applicable to all in whom there had been the exercise of faith. In the 2d chapter of the 3d book of his Institutions, he maintains at large, that the least drop (Gutta) of faith is accompanied by a certainty of election: and in the 20th section and both before and afterwards, he is express to the point, that of such a faith there cannot be a final failure.

The author has thought it needful to make the preceding discrimination, lest he should be supposed to have ascribed to Calvin, an opinion not fully his. It is Calvinism as explained by the decrees of the Synod of Dort; confessedly the line drawn between them and the Arminians; which is contemplated in this performance.

(To be continued.)

For the Churchman's Magazine.

[*The Episcopal Church has since the Revolution laboured under very great disadvantages, from the scanty number of her Ministers. In no State has this deficiency been more severely felt than in the State of South-Carolina. It must give unfeigned pleasure to all the friends of our Church, to know that, in that State many young gentlemen, whose talents and station in society opened to them the prospect of worldly honour and emolument, have, with pious zeal, devoted themselves to the service of the Church, and have already distinguished themselves in the ministrations of the sanctuary. For this revival of primitive zeal in that portion of our Church, she is, under God, indebted much to the talents and influence of a Clergyman whose useful and respectable labours, justly there appreciated, are now transferred to this part of the Gospel Vineyard. Among those whose talents and piety increasing with their years promise to make them the ornaments and supports of the Church in South-Carolina, ranks the writer of the following sermon, whose correspondence we shall esteem an acquisition to the Magazine.*]

A View of the Evidences of the Divinity of Christ, in several Sermons. By the Rev. CHRISTOPHER E. GADSDEN, *A. M. Deacon in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and Minister of St. John's Parish, Berkley, South-Carolina.*

Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all.—*Acts* x. 36.

THE Christian Church, my brethren, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, ever bears steadily in

mind, that Jesus Christ is the chief corner stone. With the utmost propriety, therefore, does she " compute the beginning of the year, and renew the annual course of her services" at this season of Advent, immediately preceding the festival of her Founder's nativity. By this regulation, so full of meaning; by the judicious selection of lessons, epistles, and gospels; and by prayers breathing the true spirit of piety, does she strive to arouse the attention of her devout children to the contemplation of that sun of righteousness which as at this time dawned on the earth, commissioned to dispel the moral darkness in which human nature was enveloped, and to nourish up man, the darling object of creation, for eternal life. Actuated by a zeal to cast in our mite to the advancement of so excellent a purpose, it is proposed in this, and some succeeding discourses, to expatiate on the character of that extraordinary person, by whose name we are called, whom we consider as the source of the most inestimable blessings to man, and who is declared to be " Lord of all."—The most illustrious attribute in the character of our Saviour is that which is assigned to him by the Apostle in the text.—Arrayed in the robes of divine majesty, God of the spirits of all flesh, Lord of all, man his creature, his subject, is here presented with an object which the utmost sketch of human intellect cannot grasp, an object of ceaseless and unbounded admiration, an object justly challenging the reverence and adoration of the intelligent creation. The divinity of Christ is, however, not only his most glorious attribute, or rather the union of all possible perfections, but it is that part of his character which it is most important for the human race that he should sustain; for if he be not God, then is he not an atonement for human guilt, then does it become unreasonable to view him as Judge of all men, and as an Almighty King destined to subdue the enemies of the Church, to protect and govern it in its militant as well as triumphant state.

It is proper, therefore, on every account, in the review of our Saviour's character, to consider first that most essential, comprehensive, and sublime part of it, his divinity.

No one who reflects on the strong current of prejudice, that pervaded the Jewish community, and the arbitrary principles which prevailed in the Roman government, will be surprised at

the obviously designed reserve of profane history respecting the character of Christ. Of this extraordinary person, but for the information of the sacred writers, we should have known very little. The evidences of his divinity must, therefore, be deduced from their writings; of course, the present argument is addressed to such only as admit the authenticity of the Scriptures. From the testimony then which these afford we shall endeavour to establish these three propositions.

1. Christ could not have been a man. 2. He could not have been an angel. 3. He was God.

It is true that all the arguments which prove Christ to be God, at the same time prove that he is neither a man nor an angel. Still the proposed division of the subject is necessary, since those reasons which may be urged against his being a mere man, do not operate against his being an angel, much less do they prove him to be God. Although then the propositions may seem to interfere with each other, it will not be difficult to preserve them distinct, and the chain of evidence will be found to be not inconsiderably strengthened by them.

We are then to show, first, that Christ was not a man.—Of himself he saith, "I am from above, I am not of this world." (John viii. 23.)* "The law, saith St. Paul, maketh *men* high priests, but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the *Son*, i. e. Christ." Here son is put in opposition to men, of course this passage is equivalent to a direct assertion, that the Son is not a man.† The fullest evidence of this, however, is to be obtained from a general review of the several particulars respecting this extraordinary person with which the scriptures furnish us. From that view, to which I now invite you, it will appear, to say the least, highly improbable, that he should have been a mere man. We find the creation scarce consum-

* "He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all." John iii. 31.

† Again: "The gospel (saith St. Paul, Gal. i. 11, 12) which was preached of me is not after *man*. For I neither received it of *man*, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of *Jesus Christ*." The Apostle here indirectly, but explicitly declares that Christ is not a man. So St. Matthew xi. 11. says, "Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist." But we know that Christ was greater; his whole life declares it, and John acknowledges his inferiority in the plainest terms. Our Lord, therefore, could not have been born of woman in the same sense that John was, i. e. he is not a mere man.

mated before the coming of this august person was announced, this great event continues to be predicted by a long succession of prophets; actions in themselves insignificant and unmeaning derive importance, and convey instruction by their typical relation to him; a dispensation of religion which seemed to be composed of form and ceremony is declared to be the shadow of better things to come through the Messiah's instrumentality. When the season for his arrival drew near, a special messenger is sent by heaven, agreeably to ancient prediction, to prepare his way, to declare that the Lord was at hand. His birth is proclaimed by an angel; an angelic choir condescended to make men witnesses of their joy at that event; yea, God himself manifested his pleasure by a memorable display of his ineffable glory. Surely that could have been no common event which was thus ushered in; these unparalleled honours conferred on Christ are intimations of a superior nature, which no reflecting mind can fail to appreciate. His birth was consistent with the events which preceded and accompanied it. It was a supernatural one. It was effected by the miraculous agency of the Spirit of God. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." Christ then, is a spiritual being in a sense different from that in which man may be so called. The angel who predicted this wonderful conception intimates this by the epithet which he applies to Christ. He does not say the child, but the *holy thing* which shall be born; an appellation which cannot be applied to man born in sin and conceived in iniquity.

As the Saviour entered upon the stage of life in a manner different from other men, so it appears that he acted on it, and quitted it in a way entirely his own. His conduct and his fortune are perfectly original. He acquired knowledge, he conversed, he instructed, he commanded, he promised, threatened, and acted not as men do. Other messengers of heaven, though supernaturally endowed on particular occasions, seem to have derived their knowledge from the ordinary sources. The learning of Moses, and the eloquence of Paul, were the effects of education. But it was not so with Christ. It does not appear that he availed himself of the opportunities of improvement which the means of his friends, scanty as they must have been, afforded. At twelve years of age he associated with

the learned of his community; and at that early period of life, before it was possible that he could, through the ordinary channels, have acquired any considerable stock of information, or that his mental faculties should have been matured, he astonished them by his answers.* As his powers were vastly superior to those even of others who had been invested with a divine commission, so he, on all occasions, exercised them in a manner totally dissimilar. The officers who had been directed to take him, being asked, "Why have ye not brought him," answered, "Never man spake like this man." John vii. 46. We need not be surprised at the answer. Christ's manner of conversation indicated a superior nature, a dignity which would awe into reverence the most ferocious heart. It is impossible for any description to convey an adequate idea of that expression of countenance and gesture, that emphatic pronunciation which added energy to every word of our Saviour: still there is a peculiarity in his very language that alone might justify the declaration that he spake as never man spake. The nature of the Deity, the obligations and destination of man, were the themes of his discourses. These were subjects which have been again and again expatiated on by the messengers of heaven; but in how different a strain. When those treat of God and heaven, the disproportion between the subject and the capacity of the writer is immediately discernable; when their conceptions appear most clear, they are at a loss for language to express them. The Apostle Paul was so lost in admiration at a glimpse of the heavenly glory, that he declares himself uncertain whether he was in the body or out of the body at the time when he was favoured with it. On these topics, as on others, Christ speaks with equal ease, of God, as a son would of a parent; of heaven, like one who had been domesticated there, to whom its glory was too familiar to excite any admiration. Thus his transfiguration, and the appearance of Moses and Elias at that time, seems to have excited no emotion of wonder, much less of alarm; to the disciples who in their terror fell prostrate, he calmly says, "Arise, be not afraid." He instructs, not as the Scribes, whose power was limited to the interpretation of the law, who could not execute it, but like one who had autho-

* What wisdom in his answer to the tribute gatherers! Luke xx. 26.

rity to enforce obedience to his instructions. "I say unto you," is his invariable introduction. Authoritative conciseness characterizes his commands, "Judge not"—his promises, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise"—his menaces, "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites." Moses, and all other divine messengers, cautiously remind men that they are the agents of a higher power. "Thus saith the Lord," is the preface of Jeremiah to the declaration, "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man; so Isaiah, "There is no peace (saith my God) to the wicked." Such, or corresponding expressions, characterize the teachings of all the men whom God has commissioned to reveal his will to their fellow men. The difference in their mode of commanding and that of Christ is certainly not a little remarkable. The promulgation of individual commands had been often entrusted to men, but Christ is the only person who has been suffered to pronounce the law, I mean the whole system of moral law, from his lips. Moses received this code on tables of stone, and thus bears it to his people; heaven does not confide so important a dispensation to the imperfection of human memory. Is it not then improbable, that a more perfect system of moral duty than the Mosaic would have been communicated to mankind through the instrumentality of a fellow man?

The method in which Christ instructed mankind in the will of God, no less than his manner, both so different from that of Moses, are intimations that he is not a man. The actions of our Saviour were no less peculiar. To obtain evidence to his mission he worked miracles. These had been performed by preceding divine messengers, and his successors, the Apostles, were also in the habit of working them. It is not, therefore, so much from the difference of the miracles then, but from the difference of the manner in which they were executed, that we argue Christ's superiority to men. This we shall evince in one or two instances. Christ was not the only one who miraculously healed the sick, but he was the only one who did this in the absence of the patient. Thus the nobleman of Capernaum found upon inquiry that his sick son had begun to amend at the very same hour of the preceding day in which Jesus, then at Cana, had declared, "Thy son liveth." John iv. 50. And a woman, who was a Greek, found in like manner that the devil

had gone out of her daughter, as had been declared by Christ. Mark vii. 29. These facts serve to show a distinction in the miraculous power of Christ; and his conduct in the exertion of this power, as contrasted with that of others, will farther illustrate this truth. The miracle of the Red Sea, of which Moses was the instrument, is thus related: "Moses stretched out his hand, and the Lord caused the sea to go back." Referring to the same event, the Psalmist says, "The Lord rebuked the Red Sea, and it was dried up." Psalm cvi. 9. Christ performed a similar miracle, and it is important to mark the different manner in which it is described. "He rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still. And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm." Mark iv. 39. Well might the disciples exclaim, "What manner of man is this!" That the wind and sea should obey him was indeed astonishing; it proved that Christ had a divine commission; but the manner in which this obedience was exacted was perhaps more so. Miracles had been performed by others, but they had not been *so* performed. There was a singularity in the manner which evinced that Christ was more than man. When Peter was about to restore the lame man to the use of his feet, he says, "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, arise and walk." Acts iii. 6. The sick of the palsy, and in like manner the widow of Nain's son, Christ thus addresses, "I say unto thee, arise." The same striking difference between Christ's manner of performing miracles and that of other persons, may be traced throughout the sacred writings. Additional examples would be superfluous.

His death was attended by circumstances no less wonderful than those which marked his life. The vail of the temple was supernaturally rent in twain, the sun was darkened for the space of three hours; the earth did quake; and the rocks rent; and the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose. It is the language of truth, no less than that of poetry, that on that day all nature groaned. Is it, my brethren, a reasonable supposition, that the departure of a mere mortal, however eminent, from the stage of life, would have been thus signalized? The Saviour was not the only victim of the world's prejudice and malice. Prior to his crucifixion, Abel, Isaiah, John, and others had died martyrs to truth and virtue. At their deaths we hear of no natural wonders. These were events which

were to be expected; they might have been hastened, but could not have been prevented by human means. They were consistent with, and not contrary to the ordinary course of nature; they, therefore, were unattended by convulsions in the natural world. Not so the death of Christ. The sympathetic emotion which that excited throughout nature's region, proclaims it to be no common occurrence, and forbids our surprise at the exclamation extorted by it from the previously incredulous Centurion. I do not mean to assert with him, that these miraculous events could alone prove Christ to be the Son of God, but, at least, that they pronounce him to be more than man.* His resurrection and ascension were characterized by circumstances peculiar to himself. Before him others had risen from the dead; but their's was not a resurrection to immortal life, it was only a prolongation of their existence in the present world. But our Saviour arose, never to sleep again. It was not a postponement of mortality, for he was destined never to see corruption. In this sense is he literally the first fruits of the resurrection. The world hitherto was a stranger to such a renovation of life. There had been an instance of an ascension to heaven in the person of Elijah. But how much less glorious was it than that of Christ? The ascension of the one was private, his disciple Elisha was the sole witness of it—that of the other was in the presence of the Apostles. The one was an event which concerned the subject of it only, the other was of importance to the world; hence Elijah's ascension was succeeded by nothing extraordinary; that of Christ by a special mission from heaven, announcing the important truth of his second coming. "This same Jesus (said they) which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts i. 11.

In addition to what has been mentioned, some of the offices with which Christ was and is to be invested point him out as a being of a nature superior to man. Christ came to abrogate the ceremonial law, and to introduce in its stead a more spiritual system—a system of piety and morality

* The dignified manner in which our Lord met the last enemy, was an indication of a superior nature which forced itself on the attention of one, no way remarkable for his attachment to Christianity. If (says Rousseau) Socrates died like a man, Jesus like a God.

as pure as it was comprehensive. His commission was far more important and more extensive than that of Moses. His laws were for general observance; he was authorized to enforce them by the most awful sanctions—future happiness and misery. He was sent to bring life and immortality to light, truths momentous beyond all comparison. He is declared to be King of the Church—by virtue of this office he is to protect it, to subdue its enemies, to introduce it into glory. These important dignities an omnipotent God might indeed have conferred on the humblest of his creatures; still it cannot fail to strike every reflecting mind as an unreasonable supposition, that so many and so great powers should have been committed to fallible man. Much more incongruous is the idea, that to such an one the judgment of the great day shall be assigned. Shall man, whose salvation is the gift of God, the mere creature of mercy, be judge of the eternal destiny of his fellow-men? Is it with a view to eternal rewards and punishments that we are commanded to judge not? Is not this a precept for general observance; and if Christ be a man, by what authority is an exception made in his favour? My brethren, it is a forced supposition, that God would exalt to the eminence to which our Saviour is raised, frail, depraved human nature; that he would resign the throne of dominion, the authority of moral government, and the seat of justice, to a being of yesterday—to imbecile, guilty man. Reason, no less than revelation, lead us to presume that Christ could not have been a man. Had he been such, probably fewer and less illustrious honours would have been heaped upon him; he would have entered the world as men do; he would have spoken and acted in it as other divine messengers did—at least, the features of resemblance in his character and that of the most favoured human servants of God would have been stronger.

I am unwilling to lay greater stress on an argument than it can bear, and it certainly cannot be necessary when the subject is supported, as the present is, by testimonies numerous and cogent. We do not mean, therefore, to contend that the circumstances which have *now* been mentioned furnish conclusive evidence that Christ was not a man. It is possible that a human being might have maintained the deportment of Christ, that such an one's appearance on earth might have been ushered in, and at-

tended by the supernatural circumstances which have been briefly particularized. Possible it is, and barely so, but most certainly is it in the highest degree improbable that humanity should have been thus singularly characterized. Each fact which, in the brief review of Christ's history which we have made, has been recited, is an intimation of his superior nature. This history supplies intimations of this truth which are strong and numerous. An unprejudiced mind cannot fail to perceive that this argument has weight; yet is it the feeblest, in proof of the position that Christ is not a man, with which we have to present you. The remaining evidence of this truth must, however, be deferred to some future occasion.

[*An Account of the Syrian Church in India appeared in a former number of the Magazine. We deem the following Observations worthy of insertion. A Church in India, which has existed for fifteen or sixteen centuries, independent of the Greek and of the Roman Church,* "*must have, in all probability, been a very early branch of the primitive Church.*" *And this Church, possessing the sacred Writings, adhering to Episcopacy, regulating its worship by a Liturgy, affords powerful Evidence of the authenticity of the Scriptures, of the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, and of Liturgical Forms of Worship.*]

ANCIENT EPISCOPAL SYRIAN CHURCH IN INDIA.

(*An extract from a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of St. Mary le Bow, London,* 1808, *by the Bishop of St. Davids.*)

"THE existence of large communities of Christians established in India for many centuries, is another circumstance of great moment in facilitating the propagation of the Gospel among the unconverted inhabitants. On this subject has been lately published* a very interesting report of *the Syrian Church*

* By the Rev. Dr. Buchanan. It is dated Cochin, January, 1807.

of Malayala, which appears to have been settled in India for fifteen or sixteen centuries.

"In this report we are informed, that there are at this time fifty-five churches in Malayala belonging to a community of near two hundred thousand Christians;—that they hold no communion with the Romish Churches established by the Jesuits in the province of Malabar; but acknowledge as their Metropolitan, the Patriarch of Antioch; that the liturgy of the Church of Malayala is derived from the early Church of Antioch; that they possess MSS. of the Scriptures in Syriac of great antiquity; that the doctrines of the Syrian Church are contained in very few articles, and are not at variance in essentials with the doctrines of the Church of England.

"The existence of the Syrian Church of Malayala is not a discovery of the present day; but the account recently given of it is rendered interesting from the reports having been made by the Vice-Provost of the College at Calcutta, who undertook to visit the Churches in order to ascertain their present state, and the actual relation of the Syrian Christians to our own Church.

"There are several important views, which result from this report of the Syrian Church:

"1. Its connection with the evidences of Christianity;

"2. Its relation to our own form of Church government; and

"3. Its suitableness to forward the means of enlarging Christ's kingdom on earth by the propagation of the gospel.

"To the evidences of Christianity it forms a powerful accession. A large body of native Christians settled in India for fifteen or sixteen centuries, neither addicted to the Greek Church, nor to the Church of Rome; yet acknowledging Episcopal authority; unconnected with any European establishment; and unsupported by their contributions; must, in all probability, have been a very early branch of the primitive Church; and, as such, affords ample auxiliar testimony both to the truth of Christianity, and to the Apostolic origin of that form of Church government established in this country."

For the Churchman's Magazine.

[*The 6th Letter of Dr. Kemp to Dr. Miller has unfortunately been mislaid. As the subject of that Letter,* "the testimony of the Reformers" relative to Episcopacy, *is distinct from the subject of the other Letters, no interruption of the sense will occur from the omission of it for the present.*]

EPISCOPACY VINDICATED:

In a Series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. MILLER, *by the Rev.* JAMES KEMP, *D. D. Rector of Great Choptank Parish, Dorchester County, Maryland.*

(Continued from p. 191.)

LETTER VII.

Concessions of Episcopalians of little weight. The conversion of men of worth and talents, to Episcopacy, a presumption in its favour. Concessions of Presbyterians of equal value with those of Episcopalians. Concessions of Calvin, Beza, Blondel, Presbyterian Divines at the Synod of Dort, Le Moyne, Le Clerc. Observations on the concessions produced by Dr. Miller. Dr. Haweis in no estimation among Episcopalians. Stillingfleet recanted. Lord King confuted by Slater. Dr. Reynolds and Dr. Edwards Presbyterians in principle. Usher, Burnet, Tillotson, Wake, White, Prettyman, Bingham, and Gisborne maintained the divine origin of Episcopacy. Hall, Davenant, and the other divines that attended at Dort, strenuous Episcopalians. Bilson wrote in defence of Episcopacy. Whitgift and Jewel were also good Churchmen. None of those quoted by Dr. Miller preferred Presbyterianism to Episcopacy; his conclusion therefore, that a majority of the English Clergy did not hold the divine right of Episcopacy, is incorrect.

REV. SIR,

YOUR letter upon the *concessions* of Episcopalians, appears to be of little weight. That men should be *decided* Episcopalians, and yet have *conceded the main points in this controversy*, is to me really unintelligible. If they have conceded *the main*

points—if they have admitted that *parity* was established by our Lord and his Apostles, and that Episcopacy is the creature of clerical ambition, produced some centuries after the establishment of the Christian Church, they surely can with no propriety be called Episcopalians. They were Episcopalians only in name, and Presbyterians in reality; to their opinions, therefore, I can attach no value.

It must be pleasing to find that Churchmen should treat the doctrine of parity with moderation and indulgence, and that they should conduct themselves towards those who hold it with mildness and charity. But a strict adherence to principle must, in my judgment, be pursued by every man of integrity, in whose mind a clear and decided conviction of the truth has been produced.

When men of worth and talents, upon a fair and full investigation of any subject, espouse doctrines to which their early prepossessions were averse, I am ready to admit, that this forms a strong presumption in favour of the truth of these doctrines. And you well know that the Episcopal Church in America has such a presumption on her side. Dr. Johnson, Dr. Cutler, and some others, as to learning and piety, yielded to none of their time. And these gentlemen were converts to Episcopacy, after the most mature examination of the subject, and in opposition to their interest, and the wishes of their friends.*

With regard to the concessions in question, lest it should be said that we do not allow them their due *respect*, I am satisfied that you should attach to them as much influence as you please. You will not then refuse to grant us the same advantage, from the concessions of Presbyterians. You have availed yourself of some different shades of opinion among Episcopalians. I have shown that this also exists among Presbyterians. You now claim some aid from the concessions of Episcopalians: I mean then to ask the same from those of your persuasion. When a writer abandons argument, and resorts to such expedients, I know no other way to controvert his doctrines.

* See *The Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson, first President of King's College, New-York*, printed by T. & J. Swords, New-York, 1805. This is a most pleasing and interesting book. It not only delineates the lives and characters of some excellent men, but also contains an interesting account of the state of religion and learning in Connecticut in the infancy of that colony.

I shall begin with the celebrated Calvin. "If they would give us such an hierarchy, in which the Bishops should so excel, as not to refuse to be subject to Christ, and to depend upon him as their only head, and be referred to him; in which they would so cultivate brotherly communion among themselves, as to be united by nothing so much as by his truth; then, indeed, I should confess that there is no *anethema* of which those persons are not worthy, if any such there be, who would not reverence such an hierarchy, and yield it the most complete evidence." De Necess. Ecc. Reform. It is said, upon respectable testimony, that Calvin wrote to the leading clergy of the Church of England, in the reign of Edward VI. respecting the establishment of Episcopacy in the reformed Churches. His letter was intercepted by Bonner and Gardiner, who returned so surly and discouraging an answer, that Calvin relinquished his plan. Their object was to confuse and divide the reformers; and thus was frustrated an overture that might have prevented one of the most important schisms in the Protestant Church.*

Concessions little less favourable to Episcopacy are to be found in the writings of Beza. And Beza, agreeably to Dr. Campbell, was "*a violent party-man.*"† Yet, notwithstanding his party zeal, he held the following language with regard to Episcopacy. "If, however, there be any, which you can hardly make me believe, who reject the whole order of Bishops, God forbid that any man of sound mind should assent to the madness of such persons." And, speaking of the Episcopacy established in England, he says, "Let her enjoy that singular blessing of God, which I wish may be ever continued to her."

The learned Blondel is said to have concluded his Apology for the Opinion of St. Jerome with these remarkable words: "By all that we have said to assert the rights of the Presbytery, we do not intend to moderate the ancient and Apostolical constitution of Episcopal pre-eminence. But we believe that wheresoever it is established conformably to the ancient canons, it must be carefully observed; and wheresoever by some heat of contention, or otherwise, it has been put down or violated, it ought to be reverently restored." This, it is said, was suppressed at the earnest request of the agents of the Westminster

* See *Hobart's Apology*, page 113.
† Campbell's Dissertations. Dis. x. part v. § 4.

Assembly, for whom this book was written. That he expressed this opinion, however, stands upon such testimony as can hardly be questioned.*

The next concession I shall offer, is that of the Presbyterian divines at the famous Synod of Dort. I know they maintained publickly, the doctrine of parity, which Bishop Cartelon, in particular, strenuously opposed. But as in a conference with that Bishop, they declared, "that they had a great honour for the good order and discipline in the Church of England, and heartily wished that they could establish themselves upon this model: but they had no prospect of such a happiness; and since the civil government had made their desires impracticable, they hoped God would be merciful to them."† Whatever this admission may be worth, it comes entirely within the limits of your position. They were speaking *professedly* of the Church of England.

About the year 1680, the Bishop of London wrote to some of the most learned and pious foreign divines of the Reformed Church, to obtain these opinions as to the controversy between the Dissenters and the Church. Three, M. Le Mayne, professor of divinity at Leyden, M. L'Angle, preacher to the Reformed Church at Charentor near Paris, and Mr. Claude, another learned French divine, returned answers decidedly in favour of the English Church. Le Moyne, speaking of Episcopacy, thus expresses himself: "What is there in it, that is dangerous or may reasonably give an alarm to any man's conscience? If such a form of spiritual administration is capable of depriving us of eternal happiness, or shutting up the passages to heaven, who could possibly get thither for more than fifteen hundred years together? For during this whole time, no Churches in the world have been under any other government. If Episcopacy was then destructive of truth and future happiness, is it imaginable that God would have given it such marks of open approbation, and suffered this Church to have been thus tyrannically oppressed for so many centuries?" &c.

The last concession that I shall offer, is that of the celebrated Le Clerc. "I have always," says he, "professed to believe, that Episcopacy is of Apostolical institution, and consequently very

* See Bishop Skinner's Primitive Truth and Order, p. 250, New-York edit.
† Collier's Ecc. Hist. vol. ii. p. 714. Ibidem. p. 898.

good and very lawful; that man had no manner of right to change it in any place, unless it was impossible otherwise to reform the abuses that crept into Christianity; that it was justly preserved in England, where the reformation was practicable without alluring it; that therefore the Protestants in England, and other places, where there are Bishops, do very ill to separate from that discipline; that they would still do much more in attempting to destroy it, in order to set up Presbytery, fanaticism, and anarchy."

It would be easy to multiply quotations from the works of Presbyterians to the same effect. But these will be sufficient to show how much it is in our power to meet our adversaries upon any ground they choose to assume. The candid reader will now admit, that whatever weight is to be given to the concessions of Episcopalians, the same is due to those of Presbyterians. And, of course, I might have considered your seventh letter as already sufficiently answered. But upon the concessions produced by you a few remarks are necessary.

I shall not travel back to the Romish divines before the reformation. I shall only observe, that we are informed by Bishop Burnet of a faction in the Church before that period, whose object was to depress the Bishops and exalt the Priests. My observations shall be confined to the concessions of Protestants.

I am aware that it may be said the concessions of Presbyterians are equally as capable of extenuation as those of Episcopalians. And something in this way you have attempted in your letter on the Reformers. But I must beg it to be remembered, that I have not adduced these concessions as either arguments or presumptions in favour of my system, but in reply to you. Your concessions you deemed of weight in the question before us. I have, therefore, a right to show, that, even admitting your position, you have made them of more value than they really are.

Among Episcopalians, as well as Presbyterians, there are writers who are held in no estimation. This is particularly the case with Dr. Haweis as an ecclesiastical historian. His history, although it bears the title of *impartial*, is one of the most incorrect and partial performances of the kind that is now extant. It is popular, not among Churchmen, but among the

enemies of the Church. Nor can it, in my judgment, be read by the discerning and fair of any profession, without disgust. For while he assumes the appearance of unusual piety, and "*has found grace to be faithful*," he omits no opportunity to traduce that Church, of which he is a minister.*

There are also some, who although in early life they may have advanced unsound doctrines, yet in more advanced age have recanted. And there are others, who have been so completely refuted, that they are set aside as church writers. The former remark is applicable to Bishop Stillingfleet, who explicitly disavowed the anti-episcopal doctrine of the Irenicum. The letter to Lord King, whose book was so completely answered by the Rev. Mr. Slater, that it has never since been deemed authority with Churchmen; nay, even his Lordship himself was convinced of his errors and mistakes.

If by Professor Raignolds you mean Dr. John Reynolds, of Oxford, whatever *he* said or wrote cannot be quoted as from an Episcopalian; for he was a rigid Puritan, and one of the managers of the Puritan cause at the Hampton-court conference. Nor is this less true with regard to Dr. Edwards. He was a Churchman by profession, but a Presbyterian in principle.

To pass by some others of little note, I will admit that the following were true Churchmen, although they may have varied a little in some opinions: Archbishop Whitgift, Bishops Bilson, Moreton, Jewel, Hall, Croft, Usher, Forbes, Burnet, Tillotson, Wake, White, Prettyman, Mr. Bingham and Mr. Gisborne. Usher, Burnet, Tillotson, Wake, Bingham, Gisborne, White, and Prettyman, maintain the *divine origin* of Episcopacy, and of whatever opinions they may have held with regard to the *necessity* of its preservation, under all circumstances, you are not at liberty to avail yourself, for you set out with this principle, "that Christians in all ages are bound to make the Apostolic order of the Church, with respect to the ministry, as well as other points, the model, as far as possible, of all their ecclesiastical arrangements." You are also precluded from any advantage from the opinions of those who maintain that no precise scheme of government was fixed by our Lord and his

* See a criticism on Haweis's Ecclesiastical History, as an Appendix to Swords's edition of Bishop Skinner's Primitive Truth and Order.

Apostles, for you contend that there was, and that it is of perpetual obligation.

Bishops Hall and Davenant, with the other English divines that attended the Synod of Dort, were true Episcopalians; for, as has already been mentioned, they strenuously maintained the divine origin of Episcopacy. They expressed, it is true, great respect for the Church of Holland. And was this to be received as a proof of their abandoning the principles of their own Church? I should imagine not.

As to the concession of Bishop Bilson, I am unable to say any thing. Thus much, however, is certain, that he wrote a very celebrated work upon the perpetual government of the Church. In this book he says, "Of this there is so perfect record in all the histories and Fathers of the Church, that I much muse with what face men who have any taste of learning, can deny that the vocation of Bishops came from the Apostles. For if their succession be Apostolic, their function cannot choose, but be likewise Apostolic; and that they succeed the Apostles and Evangelists in their churches and chairs, may inevitably be proved."

Of these illustrious Churchmen then, the number from whom your doctrine derives any countenance is reduced to few. And still of this small number, Whitgift and Jewel were zealous Churchmen, although their opinions may not have been very precise on some points. Of Bishop Morton, Bishop Croft, and Bishop Forbes, I shall leave you in peaceable possession, with only remarking, that they do not vary from correct Episcopalians more than you vary from some of your Presbyterian brethren.

And now, Sir, what is gained by the concessions of Episcopalians? May I not return, with great justice, your own language? Have these "divines said, in their most unguarded moments, that they considered Presbyterianism as an institution of Christ or his Apostles? Did they ever express a preference of this form of government to the Episcopal form? Did they, in short, ever do more than acknowledge," that Presbyterianism, when established in cases of necessity, ought to be viewed with a favourable aspect? Your conclusion, therefore, that the best judges have "considered a large majority of the English clergy, at all periods since the reformation, as ad-

vocates of the constitution of the national Church, not on the principles of divine right, but of human expediency," will stand as a proof, how easy it is to come at any doctrine which the mind is anxious to believe. The truth is exactly the converse. A majority, even of those you have quoted, held the doctrine of the divine origin of Episcopacy.

(To be continued.)

REVIEW.

For the Churchman's Magazine.

Cælebs in search of a Wife. Comprehending Observations on Domestic Habits and Manners, Religion and Morals. 2 *vols.* 12mo. *From the second London edition. New-York. T. & J. Swords.* 1809.

[Concluded from page 233.]

INCULCATING as this performance does in a correct, perspicuous, and flowing style, the soundest principles in religion and morals, and exposing in a masterly manner the defects of various religious characters, it is with diffidence we presume to qualify the general commendations which in our preceding number we bestowed upon it. We think a leading defect of the work is its exclusion of every motive to duty but the *love of God.* That this should be the *supreme* motive, and should control and regulate every other, no Christian can deny. But it would certainly, as we conceive, be difficult to prove, that, in subordination to the love of God, the Christian may not lawfully act from a principle of *sympathy*, from a *regard to his own happiness*, and from a *desire to obtain the esteem of his fellow men.* All these principles, when not animated and directed by a paramount sentiment of love to God, would be imperfect, erroneous and dangerous motives to duty. But we are not prepared to acquiesce in what appears to be the object of the writer of Cœlebs to inculcate, that every Christian character is defective which is influenced in the least degree by any of these principles. The divine author of the Christian system sanctioned a *regard to our own interest and happiness*

as a principle of action, when he allowed us to claim from others what in similar circumstances they might justly demand from us. And an inspired Apostle constituted the principle of *sympathy* or fellow feeling among the justifiable motives to beneficence, when he commands us, "Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; and them that suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body."*

A regard to the *praise of men* the writer of Cœlebs seems most desirous to exclude from the principles of Christian duty. The love of fame is indeed one of the most dangerous passions of our nature. It nourishes the lawless plans of ambition, and prompts the ravages of conquest. And too often the rising purposes of piety are checked, and the progress of Christian holiness arrested by an undue regard to the opinion of the world. But these lamentable effects arise from carrying the love of praise to excess, and from mistaking the persons at whose approbation the Christian may lawfully aim. While he values chiefly the praise of the virtuous, and seeks supremely the honour which cometh from God, there will be no danger that his virtues will be tarnished by undue compliances with public opinion; or that his purposes of duty will be shaken by a regard to the censure or the favour of the world. Had the love of praise been utterly incompatible with the Christian character, the Scriptures would have pronounced it so. But on the contrary, we find exhibited as one motive to the practice of righteousness, the considerations, "He that followeth after righteousness and mercy findeth life, righteousness, and *honour*."† "He that diligently seeketh good, procureth *favour*."‡ "The righteous shall be had in *everlasting remembrance*."§ "The memory of the just is *blessed*."‖ And Christ himself directed his censure not against those who *loved the praise of men;* but against those who "loved the praise of *men more* than the praise of God."¶ So powerful indeed is

* Heb. xiii. 3. † Prov. xxi. 21. ‡ Prov. xi. 27.
§ Psal. cxii. 6. ‖ Prov. x. 7.

¶ We were not a little astonished to find the writer of Cœlebs in an excessive zeal to condemn a regard to human applause, only partially quoting the language of our Saviour, and thus entirely changing the object of his censure. "Human applause is not a Christian principle of action; nay, it is so adverse to Christianity, that our Saviour himself assigns it as a powerful cause of men's not believing, or at least not confessing him, *because they loved the praise of men.* The eager desire of fame is a sort of separation line between Paganism and Christianity. The

this passion, and so dangerous when unduly indulged, that the Christian cannot too sedulously guard it. And while he habitually reflects that "the world and the things thereof pass away," he will not sacrifice to worldly applause, that favour of God which only "abideth for ever." But make the Christian entirely insensible to the opinions of his fellow men—You cast a forbidding gloom over his piety; you endanger his benevolence; you chill his social affections; you extinguish his social joys. How much more correct and interesting, and how much more capable of imitation would the character of *Lucilla* have appeared, had her fervent spirit of piety regulated, instead of excluding those subordinate indeed but allowable principles of action, a regard to personal gratification, and a desire to merit and obtain the good opinion of those with whom we are connected by the ties of kindred, of friendship, and of social life?

Among the variety of false professors of religion, whom this performance so justly exposes, we are sorry one was omitted—that of the *schismatic fanatic;* who under a pretence of zeal for the glory of God, rends the unity of the Church, by despising its institutions and trampling on its order. Such characters are common in *Britain*, and not in Britain only; and we know no greater enemies, whether designedly or not, to sound Christianity and the Christian church.

But notwithstanding these defects, and some lesser ones which could be pointed out, we esteem this work judicious and seasonable; correct in its principles; rational, yet fervent in its piety; and eminently calculated to raise the tone of Christian morals. The Christian will value it for its piety; the reader who seeks only amusement will not find it wholly barren of interesting incident; and the man of taste will be gratified by its neat perspicuous and flowing style, and by its apt and classical illustrations. An accidental circumstance placed a copy of it in our possession. And so delighted were we with its correct and pious tendency, that without delay we transferred it to the

ancient philosophers have left us many shining examples of moderation in earthly things, and of the contempt of riches. So far the light of reason, and a noble self-denial carried them; and many a Christian may blush at these instances of their superiority; but of an indifference to fame, of a deadness to human applause, except as founded on loftiness of spirit, disdain of their judges, and self-sufficient pride, I do not recollect any instance." Our Saviour, by this partial quotation, is here made to censure the love of the praise of men. But, in fact, he only censured those, who "loved the praise of men *more* than the praise of God." Mat.

Publishers, who, we trust, while they offer so valuable a work to the public, will be remunerated by its general circulation.

From a well drawn character of a parish clergyman, we select the following.

" He is careful not to hurry over the prayers in so cold, inattentive, and careless a manner, as to make the audience suspect he is saving himself, that he may make a greater figure in delivering the sermon. Instead of this, the devout, reverential, and impressive manner in which he pronounces the various parts of the Liturgy, best prepares his own heart, and the hearts of his people, to receive benefit from his discourse. His petitions are delivered with such sober fervour, his exhortations with such humble dignity, his thanksgivings with such holy animation, as carry the soul of the hearer along with him. When he ascends the pulpit, he never throws the liturgical service into the back ground by a long elaborate composition of his own, delivered with superior force and emphasis. And he pronounces the Lord's prayer with a solemnity which shows that he recollects its importance and its author.

" In preaching, he is careful to be distinctly heard, even by his remotest auditors, and by constant attention to this important article, he has brought his voice, which was not strong, to be particularly audible. He affixes so much importance to a distinct delivery, that he smilingly told me, he suspected the grammatical definition of a substantive was originally meant for a clergyman, whose great object it was, if possible, *to be seen*, but indispensably to be *heard*, *felt*, *and understood*.

" His whole performance is distinguished by a grave and majestic simplicity, as far removed from the careless reader of a common story, as from the declamations of an actor. His hearers leave the church, not so much in raptures with the preacher, as affected with the truths he has delivered. He says, he always finds he has done most good when he has been least praised, and that he feels most humbled when he receives the warmest commendation, because men generally extol most the sermons which have probed them least; whereas those which really do good, being often such as make them most uneasy, are consequently the least likely to attract panegyric. ' *They* only bear true testimony to the excellence of a discourse,' added he, ' not who commend the composition or the delivery, but who are led by it to examine their own hearts, to search out its corruptions, and to reform their lives. Reformation is the flattery I covet.'

" He is aware that the generality of hearers like to retire from a sermon with the comfortable belief, that little is to be done on *their* parts. Such hearers he always disappoints, by leaving on their minds at the close, some impressive precept deduced

from, and growing out of the preparatory doctrine. He does not press any one truth to the exclusion of all others. He proposes no subtilties, but labours to excite seriousness, to alarm the careless, to quicken the supine, to confirm the doubting. He presses eternal things as things near at hand; as things in which every living man has an equal interest."

We conclude with the following extract.

"As I wish to put you in possession of whatever relates to the mind of Lucilla, I will devote this letter to answer your inquiries respecting her cheerful conformity to what you call our 'sober habits of life;' and her indifference to those pleasures which are usually thought to constitute the sole happiness of young women of a certain rank.

"Mrs. Stanley and I are not so unacquainted with human nature, as to have pretended to impose on her understanding, by attempting to breed her up in entire ignorance of the world, or in perfect seclusion from it. She often accompanied us to town for a short time. The occasional sight of London, and the frequent enjoyment of the best society, dissipated the illusions of fancy. The bright colours with which young imagination, inflamed by ignorance, report and curiosity, invests unknown and distant objects, faded under actual observation. Complete ignorance and complete seclusion form no security from the dangers incident to the world, or for correct conduct at a distance from it. Ignorance may be the safety of an ideot, and seclusion the security of a nun. Christian parents should act on a more large and liberal principle, or what is the use of observation and experience? The French women of fashion, under the old regime, were bred in convents, and what women were ever more licentious than many of them, as soon as marriage had set them at liberty?

"I am persuaded that the best intended formation of character, if founded on ignorance or deceit, will never answer. As to Lucilla, we have never attempted to blind her judgment. We have never thought it necessary to leave her understanding out of the question, while we were forming her heart. We have never told her that the world is a scene absolutely destitute of pleasure: we have never assured her that there is no amusement in the diversions which we disapprove. Even if this assurance had not been deceitful, it would have been vain and fruitless. We cannot totally separate her from the society of those who frequent them, who find their happiness in them, and whom she would hear speak of them with rapture.

"We went upon other grounds. We accustomed her to reflect that she was an intellectual creature; that she was an immortal creature; that she was a Christian. That to an intellectual being, diversions must always be subordinate to the exercise of the mental faculties; that to an immortal being,

born to higher hopes than enjoyments, the exercise of the mental faculties must be subservient to religious duties. That in the practice of a Christian, self-denial is the turning point, the specific distinction. That as to many of the pleasures which the world pursues, Christianity requires her votaries to live above the temptations which they hold out. She requires it the more especially, because Christians in our time, not being called upon to make great and trying sacrifices, of life, of fortune, and of liberty; and having but comparatively small occasions to evidence their sincerity, should the more cheerfully make the petty but daily renunciation of those pleasures which are the very element in which worldly people exist.

"We have not misled her by unfair and flattering representations of the Christian life. We have not, with a view to allure her to embrace it on false pretences, taught her that when religion is once rooted in the heart, the remainder of life is uninterrupted peace and unbroken delight; that all shall be perpetually smooth hereafter, because it is smooth at present. This would be as unfair as to show a raw recruit the splendours of a parade day, and tell him it was actual service. We have not made her believe that the established Christian has no troubles to expect, no vexations to fear, no storms to encounter. We have not attempted to cheat her into religion, by concealing its difficulties, its trials, no, nor its unpopularity.

"We have been always aware, that to have enforced the most exalted Christian principles, together with the necessity of a corresponding practice, ever so often and so strongly, would have been worse than foolish, had we been impressing these truths one part of the day, and had on the other part, been living ourselves in the actual enjoyment of the very things against which we were guarding her. My dear Charles, if we would talk to young people with effect, we must, by the habits of which we set them the example, dispose them to listen, or our documents will be something worse than fruitless. It is really hard upon girls to be tantalized with religious lectures, while they are at the same time tempted to every thing against which they are warned; while the whole bent and bias of the family practice are diametrically opposite to the principles inculcated.

"In our own case I think I may venture to affirm, that the plan has answered. We endeavoured to establish a principle of right, instead of unprofitable invective against what was wrong. Perhaps there can scarcely be found a religious family in which so few anathemas have been denounced against this or that specific diversion, as in ours. We aimed to take another road. The turn of mind, the tendency of the employment, the force of the practice, the bent of the conversation, the spirit of the amusement, have all leaned to the contrary direction, till the habits are gradually worked into a kind of nature. It would be

cruel to condemn a creature to a retired life without qualifying her for retirement; next to religion, nothing can possibly do this but mental cultivation in women who are above the exercise of vulgar employments. The girl who possesses only the worldly acquirements—the singer and the dancer—when condemned to retirement, may reasonably exclaim with Milton's Adam, when looking at the constellations,

Why all night long shine these?
Wherefore if none *behold?*

"Now the woman who derives her principles from the Bible, and her amusements from intellectual sources, from the beauties of nature, and from active employment and exercise, will not pant for *beholders*. She is no clamorous beggar for the extorted alms of admiration. She lives on her own stock. Her resources are within herself. She possesses the truest independence. She does not wait for the opinion of the world to know if she is right; nor for the applause of the world to know if she is happy.

"Too many religious people fancy that the infectious air of the world is confined to the ball-room, or the play-house, and that when you have escaped from these you are got out of the reach of its contagion. But the contagion follows wherever there is a human heart left to its own natural impulse. And though I allow that places and circumstances greatly contribute to augment or diminish the evil; and that a prudent Christian will always avoid an atmosphere which he thinks not quite wholesome; yet whoever lives in the close examination of his own heart, will still find something of the morbid mischief clinging to it, which will require constant watching, whatever be his climate or his company.

"I have known pious persons who would on no account allow their children to attend places of gay resort, who were yet little solicitous to extinguish the spirit which these places are calculated to generate and nourish. This is rather a geographical than a moral distinction. It is thinking more of the place than of the temper. They restrain their persons; but are not careful to expel from their hearts the dispositions which excite the appetite, and form the very essence of danger. A young creature cannot be happy who spends her time at home in amusements destined for exhibitions, while she is forbidden to be exhibited.

"But while we are teaching them that Christianity involves an heroic self-denial; that it requires some things to be done, and others to be sacrificed, at which mere people of the world revolt; that it directs us to renounce some pursuits because they are wrong, and others because they are trifling—we should, at the same time, let them see and feel, that to a Christian the region of enjoyment is not so narrow and circumscribed, is not so

barren and unproductive, nor the pleasures it produces so few and small, as the enemies of religion would insinuate. While early habits of self-denial are giving firmness to the character, strengthening the texture of the mind, and hardening it against ordinary temptations—the pleasures and employments which we substitute in the stead of those we banish must be such as tend to raise the taste, to invigorate the intellect, to exalt the nature, and enlarge the sphere of enjoyment; to give a tone to the mind, and an elevation to the sentiments, which shall really reduce to insignificance the pleasures that are prohibited.

"In our own instance, I humbly trust, that, through the divine blessing, perseverance has been its own reward. As to Lucilla, I firmly believe that right habits are now so rooted, and the relish of superior pleasures so established in her mind, that had she the whole range of human enjoyment at her command; had she no higher consideration, no fear of God, no obedience to her mother and me, which forbad the ordinary dissipations, she would voluntarily renounce them, from a full persuasion of their empty, worthless, unsatisfying nature, and from a superinduced taste for higher gratifications.

"I am as far from intending to represent my daughter as a faultless creature as she herself is from wishing to be so represented. She is deeply conscious both of the corruption of her nature and the deficiencies of her life. This consciousness, I trust, will continue to stimulate her vigilance, without which all religion will decline; and to maintain her humility, without which all religion is vain.

"My dear Charles! a rational scene of felicity lies open before you both. It is lawful to rejoice in the fair perspective, but it is safe to rejoice with trembling. Do not abandon yourself to the chimerical hope, that life will be to you what it has never yet been to any man—a scene of unmingled delight. This life, so bright in prospect, will have its sorrows. This life, which at four and twenty seems to stretch itself to an indefinite length, will have an end. May its sorrows correct its illusions! May its close be the entrance on a life, which shall have no sorrows and no end."

INSTITUTION.

THERE is a difference in the meaning of the terms INDUCTION and INSTITUTION which is not always correctly understood. INDUCTION is the vesting of the minister with the temporalities of the congregation, and in the Church of England is performed by the patron of the living, who also appoints the minister; and

in the Church in this country, the vestry or congregation choose the minister and fix his salary and other temporalities. The Bishop, or some minister appointed by him, *institutes* the minister thus chosen to the *spiritual charge* of the congregation. The nature of the settlement of the minister, both as to the continuance of his pastoral connection and the salary which he receives, is determined by mutual contract between the parties. The above distinction between induction and institution was recognized by the last General Convention; who altered the office of induction which they had prescribed agreeably to the above principles, and entitled it an *Office of Institution.*

On Tuesday, the 8th of August, 1809, the Rev. Nathanael Bowen, formerly Rector of St. Michael's Church, Charleston, was instituted Rector of Grace Church, in the city of New-York. The office of institution was performed by the Right Rev. Bishop Moore, assisted by the Rev. Mr. Jones as *instituting minister*, and morning prayer was read by the Rev. Mr. Lyell, and a sermon suitable to the occasion preached by the Rev. Mr. Harris. On Tuesday August 29, 1809, the Rev. Thomas Y. How was instituted an assistant minister of Trinity Church, by the Right Rev. Bishop Moore, assisted by the Rev. Dr. Beach as instituting minister. Morning prayer was read by the Rev. Mr. Lyell, and a sermon suitable to the occasion preached by the Rev. Dr. Beach.

ERRATA.

Page 116, note, line 3, for ντεξουσαιον, read αυτεξουσιον.
Same line, after "been," read "called."
117, line 1, for "subtility," read "subtilty."
119, line 11, for "προεχομεθα," read "προεχομεθα."
ibid. line 17, for "προητιασαμεθα," read "προητιασαμεθα."
ibid. line 2 from bottom, for "covenat," read "covenant."
122, line 18, for "Apostles," read "Apostle."
206, line 3 from bottom, after "for," read "if."
207, line 12 from bottom, for "upon," read "up, on."
213, line 3 from bottom, after "contemplated," for "is," read "as."
215, line 7, for "Palegians," read "Pelagians."
ibid. line 26, for "so" before subversive, read "as."
ibid. line 28, transfer asterisk to end of preceding paragraph.